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Introduction

In his day, there was probably no more steadfast and prolific proponent of the Swedish scientist and philosopher Emanuel Swedenborg (1699-1772) than Horatio Willis Dresser (1866-1954) whose life bridged the period between Reconstruction and the nationally televised hearings of Wisconsin Senator Joseph R. McCarthy seeking to prove Communist infiltration of the U.S. Army. Born into a household that held strongly to the belief that healing and religion were intimately entwined, Dresser spent a lifetime speculating, testing, and practicing the interrelationship of the two. A prolific author schooled by some of the nation’s best minds, he drew upon sources ancient and modern to construct a view of the natural and spiritual worlds. A lifelong admirer of Swedenborg, his views of the man and his world ebbed and flowed with the times as he sought to fit the seer’s ideas and beliefs into the intellectual constructs of modernity and postmodernism. One of the founders of the movement known as New Thought, he was considered among its more popular and coherent spokespersons.¹

Horatio’s parents, Julius Alphonso Dresser (1838-1893) and Annetta Gertrude Seabury (1843-1935), had once been patients of the healer Phineas Parkhurst Quimby of Portland, Maine, whose introspective experiences in the healing arts challenged much of the commonsense knowledge of the day. Beginning as an inquisitive mesmerist, Quimby had analyzed his own as well as his patients’ experiences in the healing encounter, eventually replacing many of the reigning mesmeric practices with what he called the “silent method” in which patients were encouraged to discover their own inner spiritual power as the means to overcome disease and illness. Once cured under Quimby’s guidance of their illnesses, Julius and Annetta moved to
Boston where the couple opened a mental healing practice based on the so-called “Quimby System of Mental Treatment.” In addition, they wrote articles for various periodicals and defended their healing theories and techniques against the ideas of Mary Baker Eddy who, unlike the Dressers, organized a church-based healing system known as the Church of Christ, Scientist.

In their practice at 14 West Chester Park, the Dressers offered a twelve-step set program that explained health as spiritual in nature, the outer reflection of a person’s inner world, or what they identified as “the Christ within.” Following Quimby’s format, they explained disease as false beliefs and opinions holding body in bondage. The program followed a set format:

1. A description and analysis of the life of the mind and the effect of erroneous beliefs.
2. Learning the power of thought and the part played by fear.
3. Discussion of Divine immanence.
4. The nature of matter and the influence of the mind on the body.
5. The subconscious after-effects of opinions and beliefs.
7. The spiritual nature of human beings with the distinction between the historical Jesus and the universal ideal of Christ.
8. Dispelling the fear of death for an eternal spiritual life that was poised, calm, and free.
9. The real intent of human experience and “the wisdom of the situation,”
10. The hidden effects of fear as “the backbone of disease.”
11. The power of thought.
12. The fundamental principles of a comprehensive spiritual philosophy of life.
In honor of Quimby, Annetta published *The Philosophy of P. P. Quimby* (1895), a book of recollections outlining her mentor’s life, philosophy, and healing methods. The book also included samples of Quimby’s unpublished manuscripts which she and others had helped edit. Four years later, Julius published *The True History of Mental Science* (1899) containing a series of lectures delivered at the Church of the Divine Unity in Boston. Evident in all his lectures was a deep and abiding regard for Plato, Emerson, and the healing practices of Quimby.  

Horatio Willis, the oldest of the Dresser children, was born in 1866, in Yarmouth, Maine, the year of Quimby’s death. At thirteen he left primary school to learn telegraphy and, three years later, was managing a railroad station on the Central Pacific line in Pinole, California. Several years later, he returned to New England to become a reporter for the *New England Farmer*. Like his father, he was an ardent admirer of Emerson, a factor that would eventually influence a lifetime of writing and lecturing. In 1884, he joined his parents at their mental healing practice in Boston which catered to the city’s ageing population of Transcendentalists, Unitarians, Theists, and lapsed Eddyites.* Armed with strong communication skills, he became known among the town’s spiritualists as having mediumship abilities and a degree of telepathic powers.  

Horatio admired his parents’ generation for having replaced the material conception of disease with theories of healing based on the power of the mind. They replaced the harsh healing protocols of conventional medicine with gentle reasoning, auto-suggestion, and self-affirmation. The essential elements to bodily health and healthy-mindedness† required the calmness of the healer; the patient’s willingness to cooperate; a mind freed of inner discord; and a feeling of

---

* The term refers to Mary Baker Eddy, founder of Christian Science.
† The term was first coined by William James.
“oneness” with God. To the extent that the diseased body or “sick soul” was capable of putting faith to practice as Jesus intended, the individual could adjust his or her inmost thoughts and external actions to the fullness of God’s love.

In 1891, Horatio entered Harvard and, while working on his baccalaureate (he withdrew following his father’s death in 1893), wrote and delivered lectures around the town under the general title of “Talks on Life in Relation to Health.” One of these talks, published as *The Immanent God: An Essay* (1895), referred to God as love, and evolution as God’s method of creation—a power shared with His creatures once they had progressed sufficiently in intelligence and reasoning. That same year, he published *The Power of Silence: A Study of the Values and Ideals of the Inner Life*, capturing much of what Quimby and his parents had been advocating in their healing practices. By 1903, the book had gone through fifteen editions.

*The Power of Silence* consisted of a series of lectures delivered before several metaphysical societies in the Boston area. In them, Dresser advocated meditation (i.e., entering the silence) as a method of mental healing. Disease and illness, which he considered conditions of the whole person, could be addressed by concentrating the mind on an uplifting thought or idea, thereby encouraging the individual to live purposefully through healthy-mindedness. He felt that the newly developed science of psychology offered valuable insight into this inner world of the individual. A better understanding of the subconscious allowed humans to turn away from the “hurrying” world and, in a state of calmness, reason, and intuitiveness, discover harmony within themselves. “He who thus knows himself,” Dresser wrote, “whose motive is right, may go forth into the world unconcernedly, for the conditions we attract depend upon the attitude within.” Whenever the soul’s awakening occurred, it became a turning-point in life, sustaining and guiding the individual through times of struggle, doubt, and weakness.
As a devotee of Emerson, the prophet of self-reliance, Dresser celebrated individuality as an escape into freedom, i.e., the attainment of a higher self, or Christ-ideal. In other words, the self-reliant individual was the Christ-centered soul operating in an environment of calm, self-possessed consciousness and self-realization. He challenged humans to find their place in the world, to learn the wisdom surrounding their circumstances, and become a center of force or consciousness bringing value to themselves and society. It was this Christ-ideal that brought the individual and the Absolute together in unity. In his plea for individualism, Dresser viewed the world not as a stage for the individual to flaunt his egoism, but as a place of social harmony and love born of the Christ-ideal. To the degree that each individual moved consciously toward self-analysis and interaction with other minds—avoiding creeds, dogmas, and customs along the way—true individuality could be realized along with the fullness of human freedom. At such moments, the individual became the owner, not the property, of belief. Only then was the individual spiritually free in his or her ascent into liberty and the broadening of life and self-understanding.

As with many in his generation, Dresser had come to believe that a spiritual movement was imminent in the world, a belief strongly encouraged by the convening of the World’s Parliament of Religions that met in Chicago at the time of the Columbian Exposition in 1893. The experience broadened his appreciation of religious belief to include many of the great religions of the world. As an admirer of Victor Cousin’s philosophy of eclecticism, he accepted the proposition that all great religions (and their philosophies) contained within them elements of truth. He was therefore open to a spiritual household where all of God’s children could come together as one family in mutual respect, a community of spirit, and a devotion to righteousness.
He hoped for a “religion of spirit” rather than of creed or dogma, and inclusive of all the sacred books of the West and East.\textsuperscript{10}

While many viewed the age as predominantly one of invention and discovery, a conclusion easily drawn from the technology and mechanical discoveries introduced at the Columbian Exposition, Dresser predicted that in future years it would be far better known as a time when no organism, society, institution, philosophy, religion, or nation stood apart from the process of evolution. Notwithstanding the implications of dysteleology in Darwin’s theory of natural selection, Dresser thought it absurd to think that evolution implied an absent God. Evolution may be the law of life, but it did not negate God’s ontological presence.

For himself, Dresser preferred a theistic approach to God, finding Him \emph{in} rather than identical \emph{with}, the world. Life, he explained, was the result of a “continuous divine communication” and not the detritus of some momentary event in the distant past. To the extent that creation was continuous, he urged humanity’s “wise adjustment to and intelligent cooperation with” it.\textsuperscript{11} Evolution was a sometimes messy process which included the adaptation of a species through chance or random variations. But there remained throughout the process an intervening Providence who participated in the final product. In this manner, Providence worked together with humanity to supplant strictly biological evolution with mental evolution aimed at blunting the more brutish aspects of life’s struggles. In fact, God and humanity constituted a single Intelligence that ultimately reconciled evolution in the concept of Design.\textsuperscript{12}

It was during this seasoning of Dresser’s spiritual interests that he helped to organize the Metaphysical Club of Boston (1895) formed “to promote interest in and the practice of a true spiritual philosophy of life and happiness; to show that through right thinking one’s loftiest ideas
may be brought into perfect realization; [and] to advance the intelligent and systematic treatment of disease by mental methods.” The club became a way station along the path to greater appreciation of the world’s religions and growing interest in mental healing. The club, whose originators included Unitarian minister Loren B. Macdonald, Dr. J. W. Lindy, and Frederick Reed, secretary of the Greenacre Conferences, offered a “silence room” for use by its members to contemplate spiritual truths.\(^{13}\)

A year later, Dresser became involved with the International Metaphysical League whose meetings helped launch the movement known as New Thought and which, after its reorganization in 1906, formed into a federation of New Thought centers. Two years later, the League became the National New Thought Alliance whose conventions included workshops on practical metaphysics, consciousness, psychology, and individuality. In 1914, the Alliance again changed its name to the International New Thought Alliance (INTA).\(^{14}\) During these years, Dresser helped found the *Journal of Practical Metaphysics* (1896-98) which advocated for a “more harmonious, rational, and ethical life.” When the journal merged with the literary and political magazine *The Arena*, Dresser served for a time as its associate editor before leaving in 1898 to establish the magazine *The Higher Law* (1898-1902). Ever looking to expand his horizons, he traveled abroad, taught correspondence courses in spiritual philosophy, and became proprietor from 1896 to 1898 of the Philosophical Publishing Company.

As an early advocate of New Thought whose ideas and practices grew from a mixture of liberal Christianity, Transcendentalism, Spiritualism, and Swedenborgianism, Dresser believed that the mental world was the only true reality and the material world its creation. In espousing this hybrid philosophy that was simultaneously religious, synoptic, idealistic, optimistic, transformative, and eclectic in nature, he and other youthful metaphysicians spoke of a harmony
unfolding within the individual, God, and society that ultimately freed humans of their combative creeds and dogmas along with life’s material impediments, including sickness and disease.

William James called New Thought a “religion of healthy-mindedness,” describing it as “an optimistic scheme of life, with both a speculative and practical side [and which] . . . must now be reckoned with as a genuine religious power.” Drawing from both native and foreign roots, New Thought espoused an intuitive belief that a healthy-minded attitude arrived at through suggestion, silence, visualization, and repetition, could overcome negativity, disease, and even poverty. Here was the power of the mind at work setting an individual on a course of bodily and mental health, an acceptance that material and mental forces could interact at the mind’s subconscious level to repair the “sick-soul.”

Dresser married Alice Mae Reed (1870-1961), a Wellesley graduate (1893) and high school teacher, whose brother, Frederick, managed the Greenacre Conferences in Eliot, Maine, a spiritual retreat center for the New Thought movement that grew out of the World’s Parliament of Religions. There, scholars from Hindu, Buddhist, Confucian, Parsi (Zorastrian), Muslim, Christian, and Jewish faiths gathered in a spirit of friendship and openness to discuss their common interests in spirituality, revelation, and lessons intended for the soul’s happiness. Out of this endeavor came a flowering of scholarship, much of which enhanced the growing reputation of New Thought writers and lecturers.

In 1902, Dresser returned to Harvard to complete his studies. By 1904, he had earned a master’s in philosophy and, three years later his Ph.D., studying under the tutelage of William James; German-American psychologist Hugo Munsterberg; Alford professor of natural religion,
moral philosophy, and civil polity George Herbert Palmer; and objective idealist Josiah Royce, for whom he worked briefly as an assistant.

From 1903 to 1911, Dresser honed his teaching skills at Harvard, Radcliffe, and the Massachusetts College of Osteopathy. During that time, he authored *Man and the Divine Order* (1903), *Health and the Inner Life* (1906), *The Element of Irrationality in the Hegelian Dialectic* (Ph.D. dissertation, 1907), *The Greatest Truth* (1908), *A Physician to the Soul* (1908), *The Philosophy of the Spirit* (1908), *In Search of a Soul* (1909), *A Message to the Well* (1910), and *A Book of Secrets* (1911). Between 1909 and 1910, he and his wife Alice also prepared a series of articles for the popular magazine *Good Housekeeping* with titles such as “The Food Economy Kitchen and Its Value in the Community,” “Action and Reaction,” “Domestic Harmony,” “An Invitation,” and “A Talk to Our Policyholders.” In addition, he announced through the magazine that, as president of the *Happiness Healthy Insurance Company Mutual*, he welcomed the public “to take out ‘insurance,’ irrespective of religious or philosophical belief or doubt.” It was time to rise above egoistic individualism and appreciate that which bound people together.16

Taking a cue from William James who insisted that those beliefs which supported a good life should not be forged of mere thought but needed to be put to practice, Dresser spoke plainly of the value that New Thought offered of increased self-knowledge, self-control, and social efficiency. The movement’s proponents, he explained, offered an optimistic attitude toward life, a belief in the goodness of man, of life, and of the world. “They believe that by looking for and affirming the good, by expecting the best from other people and from life, they will be able steadily to triumph over the ills of life and become thoroughly sound and happy.” The psychology behind New Thought was in the metaphysical belief that “we are sane and harmonious sons of God, but are under misconception and ignorance,” including the assumption
that we were bodies possessing souls when, in truth, “we are spiritual beings born to have dominion over the flesh.”

The deeper truth which the New Thought devotees were striving for when they affirmed that everything could be changed by a mental attitude, and that there need be no more sickness, poverty, sorrow or suffering, was this: God who gives us this experience which we call life bestows it for our health, for our good and our joy, but we in our ignorance have rebelled and created friction. If we have given way to hate, to anger and selfishness, it will not suffice to affirm that as children of God we know only love, think only kind thoughts; we must actually love, really be kind, truly serve. Only by changing in life, in conduct, in what we habitually love, can we really make progress. Although everything the mind curers have taught us can be used, with radical modifications, the important point is to press on to the New Christian consciousness of our time. . . . Within each the Divine love and wisdom resided. When the love of that which was noble, good and divine became the prevailing will, the desired changes would follow.17

In 1911, Dresser was appointed professor of philosophy and education at Ursinus College in Pennsylvania where he taught until 1913 before resigning to pursue a literary career as an author and lecturer whose tours took him to Atlanta, Hartford, New York, Philadelphia, and London. In 1913-14, Dresser enrolled at the New Church Theological School in Cambridge where he continued to follow his interest in Swedenborgianism and with the possibility of his joining its ministry. Some of the more visible outcomes of this decision included his The Future Life (1914) and The Religion of the Spirit in Modern Life (1914). Between 1915 and 1917, he contributed articles for the “Home History Circle” in the magazine Home Papers, The Victorious Faith (1917), and two collections of essays titled The Spirit of New Thought, and Handbook of
New Thought, both published in 1917. These latter publications are considered by many to be the most revealing statements of New Thought beliefs and practices.¹⁸

The First World War came as a harsh reality check on the hopes and dreams of New Thought proponents as the nation pledged the flower of American youth to the ensuing inferno. Finding himself caught up in nation’s noble handshake with the Old World, he authored The World War (1918) before enlisting for service in the Fourth French Army as director of a Foyer du Soldat, a program arranged between the Y.M.C.A. and the French Army intended on improving soldier morale when the hubris of purpose had all but been purged from the fighting. As an agency providing books, stationery, entertainment, and canteen service to the troops, its program sought to sustain the purpose behind the ebb and flow of death that awaited so many in the “no man’s land” beyond the trenches. Acquitting himself without losing the ideals that had brought so many of his friends into the war, he returned to the states where he became a minister of the General Convention of the Church of the New Jerusalem and briefly as pastor of a Swedenborgian church in Portland, Maine.

In the immediate years following his return from Europe, Dresser set out to (1), validate his parents’ long-standing feud with the Christian Scientists; and (2), establish his place in the field of applied psychology. The publication of his The Spirit of the New Thought: Essays and Addresses by Representative Authors and Leaders (1917), The History of the New Thought Movement (1919), On the Threshold of the Spiritual World (1919), The Open Vision (1920), and his editing of The Quimby Manuscripts (1921) represented his promise to correct the record which Mary Baker Eddy and her disciples had codified in Eddy’s Science of Health (1875) and its many revisions. In establishing a place for himself in the field of applied psychology, he contracted with Crowell Publishers to produce a set of textbooks intended to connect the
different branches of psychology. These included *Psychology in Theory and Application* (1924),
*Ethics in Theory and Application* (1925), *History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy* (1926),
*History of Modern Philosophy* (1928), and *Outlines of the Psychology of Religion* (1929).

Sometime in the years immediately before or after the Great War, and extending until 1928, Dresser also worked on and off on a manuscript which he titled “The Psychology and Philosophy of Emanuel Swedenborg.” His purpose was to construct an integrative psychology built around Swedenborg’s law of correspondences and Divine influx. The manuscript was unique in that by selectively using Swedenborg’s writings, he was able to introduce the Swede’s psychology and philosophy into a twentieth century context, taking into account the disciplinary developments that had occurred in the intervening centuries. In doing so, Dresser interspersed quotes from Swedenborg in a way that made the choice of text read as a single author.

Being an intense admirer of the Swedish seer, Dresser regarded the law of correspondences and Divine influx as starting points to a fuller understanding of human behavior, the relationship of cause and effect, and the means by which the natural man found access to the Divine mind and enlightened reason. The key works to Swedenborg’s unfolding psychology were his *Heavenly Arcana* (1749-56), followed by *Divine Love and Wisdom* (1763) *Divine Providence* (1764), and *Christian Religion* (1771). In them, Swedenborg had explained the nature of the soul; the relationship between psychology and ethics, and ethics and religion; the concept of regeneration; and how the natural man lived in two worlds—one material and temporary, the other spiritual and eternal.

Building on this bedrock of Swedenborgian physiology and metaphysics, Dresser constructed a theory of psychology (“science of the soul”) that merged Swedenborgianism with
the newest discoveries in the sciences and social sciences. Whether dealing with Darwin’s theory of natural selection, or contemporary theories of psychology that explained human behavior as the product of natural experiences (i.e., without a soul), he felt there was a sufficient basis of truth in Swedenborg’s writings to understand the inner life of humans and those affections of the will which prepared them for the spiritual world. The endgame of human personality—a combination of body, mind, and spirit—was union with God where the “self” retained its individuality alongside the blessedness of other similar souls in a heavenly society.

Swedenborg’s psychology placed the primacy of human activity on the inner life with its “upward look to the Divine.” To the extent that the soul flowed into the human body, it followed a quest that ended not with bodily death but with a communion of happy souls in a world of pure spiritual essence. Formed with the assistance of the law of correspondences, the sense-organs were connected by “interior sight” to the spiritual world and to the purposes and ends of Divine influx. “The body is inwardly so organized,” explained Dresser, “as to carry out in minute detail the spirit’s behests,” receiving direction from their source in the Divine. “Hence the function of the body is to be understood as a terminal relationship,” he wrote. “In the ascending series, from nature and body to mind, man is once more the uniting medium between natural and spiritual things.”

Beginning with God as universal Love and Wisdom, love became man’s central motive for which he partook of activities fitted to that purpose. “Man’s being from moment to moment is sustained by this indwelling Love,” Dresser explained, “infilling his own love-nature, renewing him so that each pulsation of life, each rhythm of activity within him is from the Divine source.” In this manner, the psychology of the soul became an expression of God’s Love which, in turn, affected both the life of the mind and the body. To the extent that humans lived in
accordance with that Love, their interiors were opened to Divine influx and the body acted in 
perfect harmony (i.e., correspondence) with the Divine intent. In such a state, health was the 
natural condition and disease its contradiction. Here, too, manifestations of love radiated from 
the individual like the odor of a flower, forming a person’s signature sphere recognizable to all.²¹

Although not intended as part of the Divine plan, disease correlated that which was 
interior in the individual’s soul to the exterior body. In other words, behind every functional 
disease was evidence of the individual’s departure from God’s Love and Wisdom. Even with 
organic disease, there was the assumption of some spiritual infirmity from the distant past. The 
seriousness of the disease was but a manifestation of the degree to which the individual’s inner 
person had drifted from goodness and truth.²²

Unlike European psychotherapists whose scientific practice of mental healing operated 
independent of religious interpretations or interference, the mental healing practiced by 
American physicians was fraught with impediments. Given the nation’s high regard for 
individualism and self-reliance, the prospect of a patient’s loss of control during hypnosis 
resulted in an overall set of self-restraints imposed by the American pioneers in psychotherapy. 
While the European community of psychotherapists grounded themselves in a naturalistic set of 
psychological principles, Americans such as Isador H. Coriat, James J. Putnam, Boris Sidis, 
Mark Baldwin, Morton Prince, and Horatio Dresser chose to mix religious ideas with its secular 
methodologies.²³

During the years that Dresser worked on the Swedenborg manuscript, he found himself 
attuned to the ideas and practices of the so-called Emmanuel Movement and its imitators who 
regarded disease as something other than what conventional medicine identified as the product of
“germs” that “seizes a man from the outside, almost without regard to the state of mind and body.” Here, he explained, was the great tragedy of modern medicine in that it had failed to understand the significance of Divine immanence with respect to health. Having studied with Swiss psychiatrist Carl Gustav Jung and Austrian psychotherapist Alfred Adler, Dresser concluded that human infirmities were best attacked by a combination of religion, psychology, and medicine. It was this motivation that caused him to join the Associated Clinic of Religion and Medicine, later renamed the Associated Counseling Service, a consortium of churches and clinics in Brooklyn where, from 1931 to 1953, he offered his services in applied psychology. During this time, he also contributed articles in *The New-Church Messenger* under the title “With the Consulting Psychologist.”

The so-called Emmanuel Movement undertaken by Elwood Worcester, his associate Samuel McComb, and Joseph H. Pratt M.D. of the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, represented a form of psychotherapy that combined the functions of physician, psychologist, minister, and social worker to treat alcoholism, drug addiction, sexual perversions, and various phobias. Supported by the Emmanuel Episcopal Church in Boston where he served as pastor, Worcester drew his methodology from the writings of Fechner, Wundt, French philosopher Ernest Renan, German theologian and historian Adolf von Harnack, theologian Karl Theodor Keim, and William James. Worcester and his associates combined body and soul into a distinctive blend of Christian healing and pre-Freudian psychiatry, a methodology that epitomized the church-based clinical nature of the nation’s early psychotherapeutics.

By 1930, Dresser was in semi-retirement, dividing time between his home in South Hadley, Massachusetts, and the family’s summer home in Gray, Maine. It was then that he became affiliated with several churches and church-clinics in Brooklyn, chief among them the
Church of the Savior Unitarian where he offered personal counseling and where he enjoyed the friendship of its minister, John Howland Lathrop whom he had met years earlier as a fellow student at Harvard. For more than a decade, he continued with his writing and publishing, focusing almost entirely on topics associated with applied psychology. Exemplary of these were *Fatigue* (1930), *Nervousness* (1930), *Overcoming Worry* (1930), *Knowing and Helping People* (1933), *The Conquest of Fear* (1935), *Spiritual Healing from a New Church Viewpoint* (1940s), and *Emotional Conflicts* (1940s). Following the death of Worcester in 1940, Lathrop suggested Dresser as a possible replacement to lead the Emmanuel Movement. Already in his late seventies, Dresser declined the offer, choosing instead to continue writing on the general topic of health and inner control. He died in Boston in 1954 at the age of eighty-eight, survived by his wife, son Malcolm, and daughter Dorothea. What remains clear from his life’s work is his abiding interest in healing the “sick soul” and his long association and advocacy of New Thought and the ideas of Swedenborg.
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Life Doctrine of Life
M. Marriage Love, or Conjugal Love
N. New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine
P. Divine Providence
R. Apocalypse Revealed
S. Doctrine of the Holy Scripture
T. True Christian Religion, or Universal Theology
W. Angelic Wisdom Concerning Divine Love and Wisdom
[Note. These are the abbreviations used in John Faulkner Potts’ *Swedenborg Concordance. A Complete Work of Reference to the Theological Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg* (4 vols.; London: Swedenborg Society, 1888). The small figures at the upper right-hand corner of Potts’ references are omitted so that the brief references may be conveniently used in the context of a sentence. References mean one of two things: that the proposition, phraseology, or actual words may be found in the passage or work referred to; or that the reference indicates the best passages to consult in the connection in question. References are usually given when the authority for the interpretation is essential but are omitted when the exposition runs more freely in the interpreter’s language. The exposition ordinarily cites A. as authoritative; and secondarily W., P. T. or H.; with occasional references to E. M. or R., and other works, when these specifically apply in a supplementary way, some of these secondary works, such as R., being less authoritative, and D. still less so.]
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Preface

Hidden within one of the most elaborate systems of thought yet given to the world there lies a remarkable psychology, unique in quality and meaning. Not dependent on the conditions of the age, or on laboratories or experiments, this psychology pertains to the inner life at all times. As germane to the types of religion, ethics, and philosophy of which it forms a part, it lacks the independence of a separable branch of knowledge like chemistry or medicine. Yet it possesses an advantage ordinarily lost when human interests are divided into so many disciplines that some of the higher values which men live by are neglected. Here, goods and truths, inner states and their meanings, moral principles and scientific truths are not sundered from the central viewpoint. Mental life with its elements as the proper study of psychology as a science being thus put into a complete setting in man’s inner world, moral and religious considerations are restored to their places in a philosophy of the total universe in terms of both the natural and the spiritual worlds.

There are significant reasons why this psychology has been neglected. Swedenborg has been classed as a mystic or visionary, without regard to the fact that for many years before his enlightenment he was devoted to investigations as remote from the inner life as those most explicitly identified with physics or mechanics, and the fact that he made important contributions to branches of external knowledge before changing to psychology. Taken to be a mystic and nothing more, he has been relegated to the category of authors whose books are outmoded so far as psychology is concerned. To be a mystic is supposedly to indulge in vague symbolisms remote indeed from the values of every-day living. To have visions is of course to be
unbalanced. It does not seem credible that the same person who has passed through a period of experiences of a visionary type may also have precise convictions concerning the best-known facts in mental life in relation to the brain. In any event, the question whether Swedenborg has been misjudged seemed too laborious to consider in view of the fact that he is a voluminous writer in both fields of his special interests. Hence it was easily assumed that Emerson, for example, was right in classifying Swedenborg among the mystics in his *Representative Men*. And there is a tendency in our day to discount any system that is highly doctrinal.

The profounder knowledge of our time discloses the answer to the typical objections. Not until we understand the psychology of the author’s personality and the psychology with which he functioned are we prepared to indulge in critical estimates of the thought for which he is known in the world. Thus, we have learned to construe Plotinus (205-269), long misunderstood even by technical writers on the history of philosophy. Thanks to the profound researches of Dean Inge, adequately informed not only concerning Plato’s philosophy but in the field of Christian mysticism throughout the Middle Ages, we are now able to put Plotinus in his rightful place. So, too, we now have acquired insights into the personal history of Augustine, famed for his *Confessions*. We know that there is an intimate relation between the inner experience of Spinoza and the philosophy put forth in his *Ethics* in which he has made a remarkable study of the emotions. Certainly, the strange life of Rousseau had much to do with the writings which made him a man of far-reaching influence in his day. The re-writing of most studies of mystical literature was made imperative by the publication of *The Varieties of Religious Experience* by William James.

In the case of Emanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772), for many years a public official in his native land, an investigator and writer in the field of many special sciences, there is a reason for
knowing the man, his mental type, and his radical change of interests when he gave up his research in physics, anatomy and physiology. Whatever estimate might later be put on his theology, his mental life calls for prior study. Such a study brings out the fact that principles like “influx” and “correspondence,” pertaining to the relationship of mind and body, are of enough importance to warrant independent investigation, whatever system of thought may seem to be final. Given such a study, it is also important to try out these and other principles peculiar to Swedenborg’s teaching in terms of their practical value, noting the fact that his psychology is a “type,” as indeed Plato’s view of the soul was atypical, that of Aristotle, of Thomas Aquinas, and of other writers who were both psychological and doctrinal in their thought.

To revert to Aristotle, with whom psychology began to be a separable discipline, is to be reminded of the fact that all through the Middle Ages psychology continued to be the “science of the soul,” rational psychology being one of the later types. Men are still living who remember when the first psychological laboratory was organized, when the idea of the soul was dropped for purposes of more limited investigation, when even “consciousness” was put aside in favor of bodily behavior. Despite the fact, however, that the science has been defined anew, it is not yet reducible to less than five viewpoints. In this state of affairs, it is permissible to renew the old-time definition. Swedenborg’s idea of the soul belongs to the era in which all sciences were still akin, and in these pages the salient principles implying both a psychology and a philosophy have been selected from his works by constantly bearing in mind that the distinctions here made are not thus limited in those works.

So, too, for the sake of restricting the inquiry, Swedenborg is regarded as a seer, a term which is less susceptible of prejudgments. Seership in general implies convictions concerning the primacy of the inner life with reference to spiritual perception. That which is spiritual, we say,
should be spiritually discerned. Such discernment is as truly a human activity as reason. Some
who reason are enlightened. Others are not. Some great writers have entered a period known as
illumination, while others have not. To correlate the findings of seership is to develop an
essentially spiritual psychology. Such a psychology involves beliefs. Hence, typical mystics
discount reason, claiming to have a mode of knowledge which dispenses with or transcends it.
Our seer belongs with those who carry reason to the summit of their thought. His teaching
interprets the sacred literature of the ages, notably in case of the Bible, with its three-fold
conception of the human personality as body, mind, and spirit, in contrast with the meager view
now prevailing that man is merely “one conscious organism,” the body being paramount in that
unity.

A selective study like this is doubtless open to objection that a psychology inwrought
with a theology stands or falls with its doctrine. But Swedenborg’s doctrine is itself intimately
psychological. The idea of God is psychological in an unusual degree. So too is the conception of
human nature and human experience, described as incomplete in this natural world and implying
a psychological mode of approach to any study of the future life, thus a philosophy of the two
worlds. Psychology may be tested as the most complete in all history of this kind. The same can
be said of philosophy. Believers in the human spirit may thus reckon with the great types of
psychology, even though they have not made up their minds on ulterior questions.

Our author was a pioneer in describing what we may call a two-world experience:
experience wrought in with the natural world while involving prolonged study of the spiritual.
He took the idea of the spiritual world more seriously than it was taken by his forerunners. He
carried forward the idea of science into a region which has been sacred to doctrine long before
there was either a psychology or a philosophy of religion. Sooner or later, we are all likely to put
our beliefs to such a test in contrast with the psychical research which falls short, or the spiritisms and spiritualisms which renounce science altogether. But first we must have a conception of the human spirit. We need a more far-reaching view than that implied in current teachings concerning the subconscious or even Mr. Myers’ suggestive theory of the “subliminal self.”

‡ Dresser is referring to Frederick William Henry Myers (1843-1901), one of the founding members of the Society for Psychical Research in 1883. His research into the unconscious mind, the subliminal self, and the meta-etherial world has been documented in Trever Hamilton’s Immortal Longings: F.W.J. Myers and the Victorian Search for Life After Death (2009); Jeffrey J. Kripal’s Authors of the Impossible: The Paranormal and the Sacred (2010); and Janet Oppenheim’s The Other World: Spiritualism and Psychical Research in England, 1850-1914 (1988).
Our hearts yearn within us to know whether we shall recognize our friends. We are eager to think through to the end without a break, that we may see how the present life integrates with a different mode of existence in the spiritual world in so far as profound knowledge of the human spirit makes such a view possible. But our idea of the spirit must first be workable in this world. We need to revise our idea of spirit, considering how its structure may have room for senses and modes of action adapted to this world and counterparts of these for the life after death.

The teaching here presented is concerned with matters of vital import at the point where popular theories leave us in confusion, where psychical research leaves us skeptical, and ideas of the subconscious prove to be superficial. The objective is a complete science of the two worlds--natural and spiritual,--a science which will prove essential to any group of precepts in this life, if this life is a preparation for the life to come. Spiritual psychology as the term is here used forms part of such a science. Philosophy and religion follow. The result is a spiritual dynamism with emphasis on the affections and will, and a rational faith.

Part One is concerned with the topics usually under discussion in any psychology, coupled with principles extending beyond description and explanation to interpretations and values. In Part Two, other phases of the inner life not always recognized are investigated; and the exposition goes over into the fields of ethics and religion to complete the picture of man’s total self. A few excursions into the doctrinal world are found necessary because psychology and philosophy relate to a conception of revelation and biblical interpretation. For purposes of this study the writer assumes that the other world here in question is not the supernatural world of traditional theology but is the real spiritual world of which we might have inner experience if our
eyes were open to discern its near-by reality, if we possessed spiritual perception. In that case, the other world would not be hypothetical; it would not be assumed to explain experience. Instead, our thought would start with it, and we would set forth the disclosures of actual experience. So, for the sake of deriving as much benefit as possible from this study, we may put ourselves into the viewpoint of the seer for whom the other world was a reality in daily life and who was a zealous as any devotee of the special sciences to guard his readers against illusions, fallacies, and what he called falsities, easily associated with alleged deliverances from the so-called spirit-land. Hence the writer has tried to be as fair as he would be to any pioneer in the world of thought who, like Copernicus or Bruno, breaks with his past and discloses the universe in its magnitude where it was once doctrinally finite. The final test, therefore, is applicability to the nature of things, fidelity to life. One is perfectly at liberty to maintain that the nature of things does not cease with the world we know as creatures of habit in space and time.

This study is chiefly based on the seer’s theological works, together with biographies, summaries, collateral works, and Potts’ six-volume *Swedenborg Concordance*. The references and footnotes have been reduced as much as possible. Topical references can readily be picked out by aid of the *Concordance*. Readers who find the preliminary chapters rather long are advised to turn to chapters in which their special interests are treated.

It would be better to test these teachings by appeal to the spiritual thought and life of the day than to weigh them in the light of conventional creeds. For the value of such a conception as spiritual influx will lie as much in its utility as in its theoretical bearings. If this teaching appears to offer a better explanation of the inner life than current theories, the reader will then be ready to see how far the other principles follow. For example, the teaching that mind and body are related in intimate correspondence between internal and external states, a principle which also has its
cosmic significance. From the preliminary study of these general principles will follow a new interest in man as spirit. If the thesis of this work is sound, the deliverances of interior perception can be tested by themselves, whatever conclusions may be reached concerning other aspects of Swedenborg’s teaching. Indeed, his psychology must thus be tested if we shall eventually have a science of the relationships of the two worlds, where we now have theosophy, spiritism, psychical research, speculations concerning a future state, conflicting theories of regeneration and salvation, mingled with the vaguest beliefs concerning man as spirit. We must also test any doctrine of the future life by its disclosure of human nature as we may know it from day to day in our life on earth. The writer has ventured to call this study of the inner life an “investigation” to avoid any assumption of finality and to suggest to the reader that this is a new inquiry demanding a very different approach from that of the mere acceptance or rejection of a revelation. We estimate a theory by comparison with other systems, but we weigh a dynamic or vitalizing conception by putting it in the scales of experience. One can hardly follow this teaching in its analyses of experience without realizing that the test of its value means the ability to grow more fully into the life of the spirit. Such values would be missed if we should prejudge the seer as this or that type of person, with this or that type of visionary doctrine, without first considering the prior claims of the psychology by which he arrived at his conclusions and made his gifts to the world.  

---

§ Essentially, Dresser is challenging the individual and the community to follow William James’s directive to put ideas “to work.” In this instance, he recognizes that Swedenborg might not be for everyone; however, by “testing” his ideas, there is the opportunity to see first-hand their “living” value.
Chapter I
Psychological Types

No other inquiry is so central or so far-reaching as the quest for the soul. Out of it has come some of the best literature of the ages. Around it has gathered the most vital interests of the human heart, whenever man has sought profounder knowledge of his fellowmen, and has meditated on the mysteries of sleep and death, with the hope that he might learn his destiny. The pioneers of the spirit have given themselves as valiantly to their tasks as explorers who have penetrated regions unmapped or vast areas uncharted. Indeed, there has been an atmosphere of romance about this most baffling of all investigations. As we are to consider the result of one of these ventures into the confines of the soul, we may well remind ourselves of other reports brought back by discoverers that we may make intelligent comparisons.

If philosophy was originally a meditation on death, the first interest was to know whether any vestige of thought or capacity for action, any substance or memory survives when the body ceases to function. Sleep very early aroused such reflections. It was natural that primitive man, drawing imagery chiefly from objects around him in forest and glen, thought of the soul as a kind of double, dissociating itself from the body at intervals and wandering over the hill-tops as a hunter might go in quest of his prey. It was no less natural to suspect that there might be several souls, one or two being detachable from the body. The idea of the soul as an invisible counterpart in form and structure was the beginning of the view that soul and body correspond organ by organ and function by function.
In any event, primitive man was a creature of mood and circumstance, much as we are. Actuated at times by great compelling emotions, the subject to an all-mastering fear, and now prompted by crude pleasures, he readily attributed his feelings to objects and forces around him. Those objective things and forces were multiform and various. No less varied and contrasted were his inner states. Hence the idea of the soul expressed the mingling of activities and things within and without. It was perhaps more strictly a reading of emotions into nature than an inward response to events and things in nature. But evidently there were times when the mind was overwhelmed by a great rush of disturbing impressions, when the thunder-clap, the lightning-flash, or the earthquake broke into the ordinary sequence of things. Then, indeed, some fierce angry god seemed to dominate the elements. Yet the tendency to personify the forces and cataclysms of nature—as if the gods were identical with the sun, the moon, the sea, or the lightning—was at least a vague expression of the primitive sense of kinship between the world of forms and the inner world of feelings associated with the soul.

Doubtless the first great idea in this field of impressions was the notion that, as a vital energy of some sort fills and prompts the body, so an all-imbuing Power akin to the human soul stirs within all nature. No less early in the history of such thoughts came the idea that the soul, or some part of it, possibly the invisible double resembling the body, survives man’s last sleep on earth and continues to exist in a nether region or in the abode of the blessed above the clouds. We are apt to think of this identification of the soul with nature, ordinarily known as “animism,” as an extremely crude notion of nature or its deity. But this idea has continued to the present and is highly intelligible in the light of man’s total quest for the soul. The tendency to project feelings and impulses into nature indicates how marked is the interest in man’s inner life. Animism gave place in time to various types of pantheism, and the crude identification of the gods with nature
was succeeded by a refined idea of Spirit as universal. We are not here concerned with such
theories, but with the persistent conviction that the inner point of view is the true one.

We must presume a very long period of development before the history of ideas
concerning the soul comes to a time where one of the great psychological types received classic
expression. It was in India that the cult of the soul was most extensively developed. In that
mystical land it became customary for the religious devotee to meditate in profound endeavor to
know the soul. The contemplative life became in fact the chief aim of existence, a mode of life in
marked contrast with mundane occupations and all interest in nature. Indeed, the consecrated
devotee not only renounced the world but parted even with his family, with its beseeching
affections, to dedicate himself to sheer contemplation. Strong indeed must have been the inward
call to the lonely places of the saint, in the forests, or among the outlying hills of the Himalayas.
It was the inner life that seemed to have scope and depth, enlarging into the infinite, transcending
all barriers of space and time.

The literature of India is the output of that deep delving into the inner life, both to know
and to master the soul. We may take exception to what seems to us a confusion between God and
man as if mystically one, but how great the contrast between India with its essentially spiritual
conception of the soul and some of the views we cherish in the Occident today, given over as we
are to mechanisms that yield bodily pleasure and to materialistic tests and standards.

Underneath the diverse systems of thought which flourished in India is a remarkable
unity, rich in meaning for students interested in ancient remains. This unity involves the
conviction that we are akin through one Reality, whose law is the same in all beings, whether in
this world of space and time or above all time in the heaven of perfect freedom. All souls are
under this law, and there is no escape from misdeeds save through purification of the individual
who has wrought his own misery or in a measure prepared for his happiness. The cleansing process must be pushed through to the completion; otherwise the soul would remain bound by earthly desires, attached to the “wheel of life,” unable to attain the peace and freedom which pertain to the soul’s ideal destiny.

The central idea is that the soul (and its deeds) is higher in degree than the body and the natural world. To catch the spirit of this type of thought is to be aware of a depth and to feel a scope of meditative aspiration which we often miss in the Occident. To the partisan of that contemplative way of making the great quest, we seem mere children. For everyone who would know the soul’s reality must realize and verify for himself. Moreover, the quest for knowledge in other fields should never be separated from the needs of the spiritual life. Implied in the conviction that all life is spiritual is the belief that the invisible world of the spirit is far more real than the visible world of nature, whatever the interests which bind us to the world of affairs.

Both in our quest for knowledge and in our zeal for living we need a scale of values. The road to truth is the pathway of salvation. In the doctrine which we are about to consider this intimate relation between true knowledge of the soul and regeneration is maintained throughout.

To turn to ancient Egypt, with its tombs and monuments embodying notions concerning the dead, is to realize how great is the power of human belief when its cardinal assumption is an idea of the soul. The conceptions prevalent there seem wide as those that support the philosophies of India. For in Egypt the soul was more directly judged by its embodiment, and the preservation of the earthly garment was vitally important. Yet even in that teaching there was an idea of permanent value in so far as what is most external signifies at least symbolically what is most internal.
Our interest in the ideas of the soul which prevailed in ancient Greece begins with the period when consistent thought was taking the place of random myths. The Greeks were artists in their imagery, and to the soul they attributed many of those aspects of beauty which came to be regarded as a harmony akin both to music and to sequences of numbers which seemed to suggest the inner rhythms of the spirit. Fortunately, the more poetic among the philosophers never lost this idealizing imagery. Here was a contribution very different in type from that which has come down to us through the intensely religious imagery of the ancient Hebrews.

To ancient Greece we also owe the idea of psychology as a science of mental life, which began in a measure with the quest of Socrates for the wisdom of daily living. But Socrates was more interested in what was later called moral philosophy. So, too, Plato comingledd interests in the soul with other pursuits. To Aristotle, progenitor of the special sciences, we are directly indebted for the outlines and principles of psychology as a distant science. To him we owe not only the general conception of mental life in its relation to bodily conditions, but many of the details and terms, the divisions and subdivisions. Today we are still testing his theory that the behavior of the body is the direct clue to the knowledge of inner processes, and we still put biology and psychology side by side. There was also in Aristotle’s thought, as in that of Plato, an intuitive element surpassing that of mere analysis of bodily conditions and processes. Thus for those men of genius psychology was the science of the human self in its profounder reality. Aristotle distinguished the lower mind from the higher, using such terms as “form” and “substance,” employed throughout by Swedenborg. He also completed his conception of the soul at the apex of human experience by appealing to philosophy. There is an intimate connection between his rationalism and that of the Fathers in the Christian Church who likewise identified
the soul with the highest doctrines available. Swedenborg brought this type of psychology to its most far-reaching conclusion.

Since the science of our day has ceased to tell the romance of the soul but has reduced the various branches of psychology to such matters as the measurement of sensation and intelligence tests, we must now turn more to general literature and religion for the missing values. Every novel or short story admits us into this age-long quest, as it delves into the deepest motivations of human nature. The writing of fiction is a modern attainment, expressing our greater interest in human life, as profoundly real; and it is still permissible for writers of fiction to depict human personality in its entirety. As such, we are reminded how large a place ideals and values have occupied, and how much depends on symbols which portray the inner life beyond the range of sheer matters of natural fact. In Swedenborg’s conception of the soul, both personality in its entirety and such values as goods, truths, charity, and faith are retained throughout; at the same time, the symbology is identified with universal principles so that it is not reduced to mystical fancies of any sort.

After Plato’s time, it was indeed a tradition to revere values in contrast with factual matters since the eternal verities were said to constitute an ideal realm above the sensuous world. The term soul became a kind of value through which to signalize conduct, character, the beatific vision, with certain references to the “beyond” in terms of faith in the spiritual world. Plotinus, with his finely wrought conception of a graduated descent of realities from the One to crude matter as an outermost expression, gave to the soul a place in the scale which reminds us to some extent of the gradations of Swedenborg’s teaching. Meanwhile, in the Bible, the threefold conception of spirit, mind, and body implied an idea of the human self in which nothing was
surrendered to material fact. The Bible contains the hidden Word wherein lies the secret of the soul’s long travail through the ages.

The saints and scholars of the Middle Ages were no less zealous in their pursuit of the soul than the sages of ancient India, thinking no price too great to pay for the hermit life. Our own habits of looking within to find the soul owe very much to the endeavors of medieval thinkers who penetrate the mysteries of the spirit. We have acquired our modern thought of personality in its richness and beauty from those highly devoted people for whom inner analysis was an art. The example set by Augustine in articulating a doctrine of the inner life, by uniting Greek with Christian conceptions of virtue and the soul, was followed by others, including Thomas Aquinas. It is to such thinkers that we owe the idea of rational psychology such as we are presently to study. Christian Wolff (1679-1754) distinguished modern systems under three heads, one of these being rational psychology, or the science of the soul, as a simple, non-extended substance. We note also that the medieval period was the age of discussion of the problem whether intellect or will is the central principle in God and man.

Swedenborg’s psychology belongs to the intermediate period, after the rationalism of Thomas Aquinas, before the days when doctrine ceased to be so momentous, while psychology was still reared on Christian theology, and while it was still a science with a soul, in contrast with current theories of mental life “without” a soul. His psychology is far from being a speculative system based on self-analysis as a method. But for him, subjectivity in the sense of the primacy of the inner life with its upward look to the Divine, implied a kinship with the Christian teaching of the centuries, in contrast with the supremacy of objectivity or outwardness as it has since come into vogue, oftentimes to the utter neglect of the inner life. Moreover, the emphasis was still strong in Swedenborg’s time on “universals,” implying a realistic conception of knowledge
dating from Plato and Aristotle, which attributed the supremacy to *what is above* in all knowledge to the highest from which there is a descent to the level of sense-perception. This is in contrast with the theory of knowledge which derived its subject-matter from the mere analysis of natural experience. Swedenborg adheres to the supremacy of Divine truth throughout his system, invariably ranking universals (i.e., truths, goods) above the deliverances of ordinary perception to that which we owe such products as “memory-knowledge.”

This retrospect also brings before us the fact that the romance of the soul has related to a wider interest than that of conventional education. We go to school to study “branches” of learning. We find these branches further divided when we enter preparatory schools. By the time our college education is well started, our minds have become as systematically divided as a modern industry. We are taught to think in departments or categories. When we take a college course, we regard it as “finished,” then pass to another. Failing to coordinate the more important subjects, we also fail to correlate such matters with the teachings of the Church. Thus, the psychology which we study one year may seem to bear no relation to the literature and religion which we study in other years. Life seems too full; the demands of practical necessity are too great. Hence it is difficult to disengage our minds from the education which has shaped them long enough to revert to the stage of thought in India when all human interests were one in so far as the meditative philosophy prevailed, or even to the days of Thomas Aquinas when one man undertook to encompass the whole field of learning so far as it concerned the Church and the inner life.

Today we must return in thought to past ages to realize what it means to take religion so seriously that it is poetry, science, and life, all in one system. Swedenborg belonged to a period when it was still possible for a scholar to pass from one field to another in his study of the world
with hardly an interval in his correlating activities; and the most significant fact about
Swedenborg in this connection is that he undertook to encompass both the spiritual world and the
natural. To appreciate his type of thought is to note that, for him, many interests were part of one
system, his unifying interest being the nature of the soul even before the period of his
illumination. Indeed, it was on account of this absorbing inquiry that he passed from the pursuit
of the special sciences to the inclusive study of the spiritual life and the Bible in which he found
the Word as his great clue to right doctrine. Hence, we find him setting forth with the zeal of the
explorer who enters a land which has never been divided into states, counties, or towns. This was
especially true of the spiritual world as he regarded it, as a pioneer in his endeavor to extend
psychology into that world. In following his researches, one finds the venture most worthwhile
by regarding the entire doctrine in the light of an inquiry, the outcome of which seems at first
uncertain.

In undertaking to single out and appreciate a type of psychology concerned with human
existence in all connections, we protest the relegation of the soul to the mystical past. This does
not mean reverting to Hindu contemplation, the self-analysis of the medieval saint, or the
introspection of the self-conscious puritan. Strange as it is to say, Swedenborg’s psychology is in
remarkable agreement at various points with physiological psychology so far as the relationship
of mind and brain are concerned. This peculiar type of psychology is meant to be the corrective
of both the psychology which fosters the inward quest of the soul, and the psychology which
investigates bodily behavior as if the soul did not exist. Although it is a psychology with a soul,
the approach is unique.

As Swedenborg was a scholar in the field of the special sciences before he became
known as a seer, he blazed the way into his spiritual world by regarding it as a realm of law and
order. The result he hoped would be a science leading the way without a break from the most inferior physiological fact to the sublimest experiences which project us into the spiritual world. Therefore, we follow him with the conclusion that his doctrine is worthy of being tested without regard to the estimates put upon him by his critics. One may be as free to believe in the soul as if more recent types of psychology had never been formulated.

In contrast with present-day efforts to rise from the simple to the complex, Swedenborg starts from the spiritual life in the widest meaning of the term. Then he proceeds from the highly organized to the simple. This approach to externality has never been made with such conviction. Real knowledge does not then start with observed or tested material fact. It begins with Divine Truth. Hence knowledge is not sundered into compartments. It is not a question of inferences from effects to causes. All causes are primarily spiritual. It is a fallacy that sensations can arise by rearing their heads out of the bodily stream to produce sense-perception and then the various mental elements which are attributed by naturalism to self-operating evolution. Even in the barest moment of our sense-experience, spiritual activity from within and above meets the items which nature bestows upon us from without and below. External events are in themselves as dead as particles of sand left on the shore where they have been worn smooth by mechanical impact. This may impress us as a great assumption. But, so too, is the alternative theory which, by keeping so close to the ground facts of life that we forget to lift our eyes to the stars, holds us down to the study of bodily processes as if the life of the spirit were a mere by-product of the brain.

Swedenborg was born into a world where speculative systems still prevailed. He rejects one type of theology prevailing after the Reformation to adopt another. The interpretation he put upon Christian thinking had much to do with his convictions throughout his scientific period. In
this period his speculations turned for the most part in the direction of the natural world, especially in the field of physics, later of anatomy and physiology, and finally that of the rational psychology of his day. He approached the study of the soul from the viewpoint of these attempts to grasp the nature of the universe. So, his first psychology denoted a phase of his interest in the animal kingdom. Hence emphasis fell on reason or intellect as he then understood these terms, and as reason might articulate a system of knowledge of the natural world.

As taken over into the richer field of his later interests, his psychology therefore underwent various changes. Swedenborg did not, in the period of his illumination, first adopt a theory of the natural universe and then formulate a psychology as one of the sciences belonging to this system, as various philosophers have done. He did not begin with the facts of mental life, then infer that understanding or intellect, will or love exists; and therefore, that a soul underlies the more interior faculties. He attached little value to speculation and was especially opposed to idealisms of every sort. He relegated all inferences to a subordinate place on the ground that “memory-knowledges” do not transcend the viewpoint of naturalism. Hence, we must find our way into his later doctrine by reviewing certain facts in his biography, noting how as a seer he came to reject even the sciences and philosophy.

Widely different is the approach from the viewpoint of an insight concerning the nature of the human spirit in relation to the outward look upon the natural world and the upturned look into the spiritual, in contrast with assumptions based on bodily contacts with nature. Another group of principles and anticipations is implied. We have as good reason to be fair in trying to understand this viewpoint as in giving full hearing to the psychologist who infers that the human mind is from what he sees the body doing as explained by biology. The venture seems unusual in
our day only so far as we have permitted ourselves to be so greatly influenced by our conventional education that we have not even tried the hypothesis of spiritual insight.

Granted insight into the universe as spiritual, we may in clarification look out on the fair world of nature from within. This cosmic point of view will yield a psychology. We may take Swedenborg as guide in the effort to develop to the full the conviction that man is primarily spirit, clothed with the body as a garment, using the brain as an instrument. It is this type which we propose to develop to the full, by first considering how Swedenborg was persuaded to make the transition from speculation on outward things to an inward vision which left those things transfigured.

As a spiritual psychology this teaching is in sharp contrast with any system limited to the study of beings and things in space and time. As explicitly a psychology with a soul, the gauntlet is thrown down before all partisans of mental life who define psychology as if it meant nothing more than the study of behavior. The term “spiritual” as here used refers to the inmost region or sphere in man’s nature where man is in untrammeled relation with God. Hence the soul is to be understood with respect to the quality most interior to it; however, it may also be relegated to the body during the brief period of our existence here. This definition removes the soul from the sphere of intellectual entities assumed in the old systems to account for thought, feeling, and will as three faculties. It implies a living spirit, imbued by love as life’s essence, and an energizing mode of conduct going forth from it into the mind, thence into the body as the mind’s instrument. The test of the validity of this conception will consist not only in its power to explain our experience throughout this life and into the next, but in its application to practice. For, granted that we have the true idea of man, everyone will be expected to live by what he believes, indulging in adequate if not frequent self-examination. The test of spiritual psychology is
therefore very much greater, for it is by our deeds that we show what type of love prevails, and how far we are willing to go in the realization of the spiritual ideal. We may object because doctrine is so persistently introduced into the study, for many of us as children of the age have tried to put aside doctrine as traditional. Yet every psychology, however meager, even in case of the most persistent behaviorism, involves assumptions and general principles about human existence and the universe, although concealed as skillfully as possible. In the doctrine before us everything is above-board. It is frankly an interpretation based on Divine Truths. But if it construes the inner life properly, such an interpretation is proved essential from the start, after the period of insight, a period which develops with the effort to apply Divine truths instead of trying to ignore them.
That Swedenborg’s quest for the soul unwittingly began when he was extremely young, becomes clear when we review the facts of his life which bear most directly on our inquiry. Emanuel Swedenborg was born in Stockholm, Sweden, January 29, 1688. In studying his life in connection with his psychology, we need not pay much attention to the judgment that he was a mystic. For our interest is to note any experience which gives evidence of unusual powers, whatever the estimate put on such abilities. Describing him tentatively as a seer, we may look for signs of intuition or insight in his scientific period, then consider the transition from that period to his spiritual illumination.

By inheritance from his father, by type of mind and the inner experiences of his boyhood, also by persistent thinking on psychological topics, Swedenborg was early making ready for the opening of his spiritual sight. He carried forward his central problems and acquired his method of research from his study of the special sciences, although the interests greatly changed when he became explicitly a seer, wholly dedicated to his life-work. Whatever might be said concerning the strange experiences of his transitional period, when he was finding himself anew as a result of a deeply interior conversion, we are interested in the outcome, in the general principles which he promulgated.

We are prepared for the statement that our seer was born in an age when the forces of the Reformation were strong, and of a father who was an ardent theologian, Bishop Swedberg. ¹ His
father was also a sincere believer in the nearness of the spiritual world, and had an assured faith in the presence of angels among men and in the helpful offices which they fulfill as ministering spirits. Indeed, his father believed that he personally lived in the society of his guardian angel, with whom he was sometimes able to converse, and that he sometimes heard mysterious voices.

As early as his fourth year Swedenborg began to think about God, salvation and the spiritual experiences of men. Several times he disclosed matters which caused his parents to wonder and to say that angels must be speaking through him. From his sixth to his twelfth year he conversed with clergymen about faith. Already in that early period he held the view that the life of faith is love and that God gives faith to those who practice love. These teachings later occupied a prominent place in his theological works. Here, indeed, was the germ of his later protest against the doctrine of salvation by faith alone, and his emphasis on Christian service was latent in this protest. This teaching he seems to have acquired for the most part from his father who maintained that true faith cannot be separated from a life of charity and active usefulness. But the young Swedenborg was making this doctrine his own through inner development which inspired keen thought and growing spiritual insight. We do not find him turned at once, however, to the exploration of his own mind, to discover the meaning of his inner experiences. Nor did he devote himself to religion or theology as a natural result of his precocious interest in such matters as faith and charity. Instead of developing in the direction of introspective analysis, as if he were essentially subjective, he looked rather to the external world and soon became interested in objective research in fields which seem remote from the quest of the soul.

Having finished his studies at the university, Swedenborg set forth into foreign lands, prompted by zeal for investigation and alert for new interests and discoveries. At first he became greatly interested in such matters as the calculation of eclipses and the correction of scientific
tables to agree with the latest observations of the heavens. He also manifested inventiveness and ingenuity. Finding some globes in London that interested him and being unable to send one home or even send some of the sheets so that the globe could be set up, he learned to engrave on copper so that he might draw and engrave plates for a pair of globes. Presently he discovered new methods for observing the planets, moon, and stars. He also made discoveries in algebra. In any science he took up, he sought to acquire all that was then known in order to add some needed principle or make a practical application. For it was characteristic of his mind to be interested in the theoretical principles and in their use.

His interests were not, however, limited to the sciences. Swedenborg also found time to read the poets and to produce verses of his own. He became proficient in various languages, including those which were to be of greatest use during his illumination. After five years of foreign travel, he was ready for an appointment which would assure him a livelihood. Thus early, too, he was preparing to write and had planned a magazine to be devoted to scientific discoveries and inventions. He chose a spot for a small observatory where he could make his own calculations and verify his theory concerning the discovery of the longitude of places. He fortunately obtained an appointment as assessor in the Royal College of Mines, and in this office he rendered much service to his country by explorations and publications on mining industry. Although he dedicated all his energies to his work as a scholar, he was also mindful of the good he might do to mankind. His mind was too full of these interests to leave room for the ordinary pleasures and activities. Yet he was not so greatly absorbed as to forget those who aided him in his education and work. Throughout his life he made friends and was regarded as sociable, interesting, a man to be looked up to with respect.
Swedenborg received his appointment as assessor from the King of Sweden when he was twenty-eight years of age. He continued his work for the College of Mines until he was fifty-eight, save when on leave of absence in foreign lands in pursuit of his scientific studies. Later, he was advanced to the House of Nobles, in which he served his country as a member of the senate throughout the period of his illumination, a significant fact, always to be borne in mind. He issued his scientific periodical for two years, published an algebra, and wrote essays on such subjects as “The Cause of Things,” “A Theory Concerning the End of the Earth,” and “The Nature of Fire and Colors.” We also find him building locks for canals, investigating fires and stoves, and learning all he could meanwhile from blacksmiths, charcoal burners, and superintendents of iron-furnaces. Next, he turned to all available works on chemistry with special reference to fire and metals, in search of new light and of opportunities for confirming his theories.

Every now and then our seer published a treatise on one of the physical sciences, such as his *New Observations and Discoveries Respecting Iron and Fire, or A New Method of Constructing Docks and Dykes*. He also proposed a theory concerning the fundamental particles of all physical substances, in which he maintained that there is one substance out of which all things in the world are constituted through variations of form. In this as in other fields, he anticipated conclusions of recent sciences. The chief characteristic of his scientific thought was insight into first principles and causes. He was consequently less dependent than many scholars on the study of external conditions and effects. It was this zeal for first causes which led him in time beyond the physical sciences in search of a world-view with special reference to the problems of psychology.
During his trips abroad, Swedenborg was constantly acquiring information and preparing to write more treatises. Thus, in Dresden, he made notes on philosophical works and visited museums and factories; in Bohemia, he gave special thought to mining and forging operations. Meanwhile, as he traveled, he sometimes took opportunity to visit churches and study different forms of worship. In Leipzig, he found a royal patron who aided him in publishing his *Principia*, which contains a comprehensive theory of the natural world with reference to such questions as the origination of the planetary bodies from the sun and their vertical revolutions. In this work he also considered a possible explanation of the phenomena of magnetism in anticipation of the nebular hypothesis. He even anticipated the theory that heat is a mode of motion, that magnetism and electricity are closely connected, and that molecular forces are due to the action of an ethereal medium.

More significant is his growing desire to understand the human organism with a view to knowledge of the soul’s mode of action in the body; this interest lies at the foundation of his change from the study of nature to a study of the spiritual life. He was interested, for example, in the influence of the respiratory movements of the viscera and the organism as a whole, the theory that the organism in general respires with the lungs, and that the perpetuation of all the functions depends on this action. His physiological studies were brought together in preparation for a voluminous treatise on *The Brain*, an encyclopedic work which was not published in English until 1882 and 1887, when the two volumes appeared. Among other considerations, this work is esteemed for its striking anticipation of modern views.

These studies are notable because they did not satisfy but marked stages of development. Swedenborg followed such interests as far as possible, then pushed on in quest of deeper principles. He was also able to grasp and add to existing theories concerning the nature of things,
but was not content with any physical point of view. Hence, we find him, in his treatise on *The Economy of the Animal Kingdom*, laying down the proposition that “the soul of wisdom is the knowledge and acknowledgment of the Supreme Being.” He is now chiefly concerned with causes lying behind the physical universe. Hence, in his treatise on *The Infinite* he discusses the final cause of creation and concludes that what is Divine must agree with what is rational. Since reason is given to us that we may perceive that God exists, mysteries which have been said to transcend reason cannot be contrary to it, “although reason is unable to explain their grounds.”

Swedenborg discerns a “tacit consent, or tacit conclusion of the soul, to the being as well as to the infinity of God. . . . There is that in man as man, provided he enjoy the use of reason, which acknowledges an omnipotent God, an omnipresent and all-provident Deity; it seems therefore to be innate, and to be a power of action or reason.” Accordingly, Swedenborg seeks a means of influence between the Infinite and the finite, a uniting principle in itself infinite, so men can partake of the Divine. He finds an uplift to God, “a sense of delight in the love of God” which lifts man above himself as a merely reasoning finite creature. Man responds to God and admits His existence through his soul, which from its greater height is designed to rule the body. He may sink into bondage to the flesh. Hence a gap exists between the Infinite and the finite. But God provided for this break between Himself and man through “His infinite, only-begotten Son,” who took on Him the ultimate effect of the world, or a manhood and a human shape, and thereby was infinite in and with the finite, and restored the nexus “in His own person, between the infinite and the finite, so that the primary end was realized.”

Swedenborg finds the soul deeply imbedded in the organism and discoverable only by degrees as man becomes a rational being. The coverings of the soul are, as it were, removed so that man ascends by degrees to his objective. The doctrine of series and degrees is, in fact, the
direct means of approach to the soul, with reference to the intimate connection established between the soul and the body by influx. Further clue to this connection is found in the relationship between the interior, or prior, and the exterior, or posterior, through perfect adaptation of outer to inner, and effect to cause, by means of correspondence, the principle which our seer later used so extensively. Thus, we find him already in possession of principles which he was to use in clearer light after illumination.

At the conclusion of Part First in his *Economy of the Animal Kingdom*, Swedenborg puts in a chapter entitled “An Introduction to Rational Psychology” in which he declares that psychology is the most important of the sciences which lead to knowledge of the animal economy. He then introduces the principle of series and degrees which we find him everywhere using in his later psychology. His problem is to account for the interaction of soul and body. The theory that the influence is purely physical, that is, an influx from body to soul, falls far short. The same is true of the theory of occasional causes, and the doctrine of pre-established harmony between bodily processes and the activities of the soul. The soul is plainly higher in quality, interior in type, and prior. How then can influences from the inferior (body) reach the superior (soul) on the supposition that the cause is external? The difficulty is the same as that of the treatise on *The Infinite*, in which the Infinite is shown to be remote from the finite, without a mediating principle capable of bringing into relation modes of existence which differ in kind and degree. If there is control over both events and processes in the body and the corresponding sequences in our mental life, this efficiency must reside in the Divine activity, and include every atom on the bodily side, as well as every detail on the mental. It is necessary to trace all the steps in this hitherto obscure transition between two things that are different. Evidently, the transition is by means of steps in a series, and the degrees implied in the transition must somehow belong
in the total series of the Divine order. For the time being, Swedenborg is content to say that there
is a higher science implying the “Doctrine of series and Degrees, or the Doctrine of Order,”
which pertains to the distinction between all superior and all inferior things.

So far as he can indicate the nature of this relationship in the Second Part of his work, the
primary fact is the influx of the soul into the body, the bodily process being “reciprocal.” In the
study of the body there is need of anatomy, pathology, physics, and what our seer calls the
“auras” of the world. He is still unable to see beyond the idea of the soul as a kind of subtle,
living fluid, consisting of a primordial element imbued by the Creator. He has no clear
conception of the form or substance of the soul. It is far more evident that souls, as spiritual
beings prompted by love, should constitute a kingdom on earth, preliminary to the “City of
God,” than just how the soul in its earthly relationships is to win the triumph which is to make
this spiritual kingdom possible. Hence, Swedenborg plans even more extensively for his later
treatise, *The Animal Kingdom*, a part of which is to be devoted to the soul. A significant fact in
this research is that while recognizing the superiority of religious faith as yielding insights
“above all demonstration,” Swedenborg proposes to adapt his exposition to readers who believe
only what they can apprehend intellectually. Hence, he still seeks the soul by analytical
processes. These researches did not reach completion from the point of view which then
interested him, but, so far as this book records these studies, he makes clear his conviction that
the soul is an essence, a primary or efficient substance underlying the substances of the body. It
is also plain that intercourse between soul and body is localized in the cerebrum, “the link and
the uniting medium.”

The soul is now envisaged as “purely spiritual in form.” So, too, the love which imbues
the soul is spiritual, although comingled with love which is lower and purely mental. The soul is
quickened by this higher love to rise into recognition of God as the source and basis of its own essence, the principle of its being, its activity or life. Swedenborg sees dimly that “the physical world is purely symbolical of the spiritual world,” and he still utilizes his principle that there is a systematic relation between the physical and the spiritual. He is convinced that the visible world is the realm of effects, the invisible the sphere of causes. He has a vision of the descending series through forms, orders, and degrees by means of the influx of the soul into the body, through correspondence point by point between mental states and bodily results. He sees that the soul operates from that which is “supreme and innermost.” Hence, he is profoundly interested spirit, and his deepest desire is to discover how spirit operates through the rational mind into the body. Yet, despite his religious conviction and the desire to ground his whole thought in the conception of the Divine efficiency, his point of view is still chiefly that of physics and physiology.5

The first element of physics is the “aura particle.” The “spirituous fluid,” derived from the aura, is the first element of physiology. The knowledge of bodily processes conceived in mechanical terms greatly exceeds the higher knowledge of mental life regarded from within. The scientific works do not take us beyond this point of view. The emphasis naturally falls on the rational mind as a kind of “cogitative essence,” ethereal, and, as thus conceived, little likely to survive the life of the body. The problem was to find an interior and more enduring essence than that of the rational mind, with its intimate dependence on the activities of the bodily senses. The cerebrum might indeed be the means of communication between soul and body so that, thus far, the body was plainly enough the soul’s instrument, not merely its dwelling. But yet the content of the soul as superior to the mere intellect was not plain. This content Swedenborg was presently to discern through his insight into love as the real substance, quality, form, above and prior to the intellect or rational mind.
It will be observed that Swedenborg does not yet depend on the inner experiences of his youth to afford him a clue to the essence of the soul. It will also be noticed how very far his thought is from the contemplative method of the Hindu, or the introspection of the Christian mystic. He pays little heed to the emotions or the will but tends to an essentially intellectual view. His interests lie in the field of intimate relationships between soul and body, with the hope that he may build upon the structure of physiological fact into the higher region of the soul’s spiritual responses. He proceeds analytically, awaiting a time when a complete rational synthesis shall be possible. His dependence on analytically ascertained facts is highly significant since he is a seer, in type and by training essentially religious, with a strong inclination toward theological doctrine.

In the preface to his translation of *The Soul or Rational Psychology*, Frank Sewall emphasizes the fact that, in the concluding phase of the scientific period, the search for the soul was the real motive of Swedenborg’s labors. This interest is shown by the tentative essays on the subject, and in the increasing stress put on such conceptions and correspondence, influx, degrees, forms, and orders. Finding difficulty in completing any scheme of things based on inferences from sheer matters of fact, Swedenborg becomes deeply persuaded that “the essence and nature of the soul, its influx into the body, and the reciprocal action of the body, can never come to demonstration without these doctrines.” He hopes that by appeal to these principles, and by beginning with his anatomical studies, he will be able to ascend to the supreme sphere of experience and be able to speak of the soul with certainty and definiteness. The first emphasis falls on the principle of correspondences, which was a deduction from Swedenborg’s general philosophy of the universe and, more specifically, an inference from his search for the mode of
interaction between soul and body, by analysis of the three most prominent views of this interrelationship prevalent in his time.

“Swedenborg, agreeing wholly with neither, sought to reconcile the three by extracting and combining the gist of the truth in each, and the resulting doctrine he named the doctrine of correspondence. . . . Correspondence, as seen on the plane of nature only . . . consists in such a mutual adaptation of inner to outer . . . that there may be a reception, communication, or transference of motions and affections from one to the other. It is therefore the name we give to that kind of intercourse which is not bodily influx, or to the union that exists, not by continuity or confusion of substance, but by contiguity and modification of state. It is the relation of the affluent waves of ether to the eye; of the eye to the sensory fiber, of the fiber to the cortical gland; of the gland to the common sensory; of the sensory to the imagination; of the imagination to the intellect; of the intellect to the soul; of the soul to God. By correspondence the outer affects the inner without becoming one with it; by correspondence the outer affects the inner without becoming one with it; by correspondence things totally different in degree and substance are nevertheless so adapted that motions or tremulous vibrations in one may be continued through the other or converted into some modification of the other’s state. So, the soul corresponds in general and every particular to its body.  

It will be well to bear this preliminary statement in mind, for it implies the psychology of the later period; and if we see how Swedenborg comes by the principle of correspondences between things differing in degree, we will be prepared to understand the doctrine of degrees in fields lying beyond the reaches of psychology. Since the higher principles rest on this doctrine
that correspondence implies degrees, series, and forms, in orderly relationship, the structure of
Swedenborg’s later thought is an extension of his earlier thought. What Swedenborg did not yet
see, and what was disclosed by his illumination, was the system of spiritual realities which
correspond to the natural things already disclosed by his scientific researches. In order to apply
the same principles on the higher plane, it was necessary to have experience of that plane, and to
possess the insight requisite for true interpretation. We distinguish, therefore, between the
doctrine of correspondence as a method, and the experiences to which the method was applied in
the period of spiritual perception.

In other words, there is a difference between arriving at a conclusion regarding things as
they conceivably exist based on principles assumed to account for them, and actual experience of
the matters in question so that we depend on the experience and its disclosures rather than on our
deductions. Hence, the claim made for Swedenborg that the existence of the soul as spiritual
substance was a fact or truth learned by him in the spiritual world, not by any observation of
mind or body in the natural world alone, or by inferences of unenlightened reason. This claim
turns upon the fact that, in the seer’s scientific period, he failed to attain any satisfactory
knowledge of the soul’s essence and was unable to advance beyond guesses and conjectures. On
the other hand, his illuminations revealed the soul in its spiritual essence, even the inmost
recesses of the relationship with God and the spiritual world. We shall return to this subject when
we have the later psychology before us, for much will depend on our conclusions concerning the
nature and content of revelation.

Turning to the Rational Psychology in order to discover precisely what is meant by the
soul so far as that treatise can guide us, we find that the animus is the lower mind, while the brain
is defined as the “common sensory,” with its organs and instruments distributed through the
body. The sense-organs are not said to “feel.” These organs distinguish, receive, and transmit the forms of touch and other characteristic features of objects around us in the natural world to the brain, to which sensations are attributed. The cerebrum does not feel. It is “affected” by sensations according to its form or structure. The “animus” regarded as the mind connected with the brain, is “the form of ideas of the common or external sensory, and the active and living principle of all the changes in the body. As the animus is affected, so it desires; and as the desire of the animus such is the pleasure of the body; for the animus is such as the form of the sensory is; thus, from the form of the sensory we may judge of the animus, and from the animus we may judge the sensory.”

There follows a long analysis of the affections of the animus, including joy, sadness, venereal love, venereal hatred and aversion, marriage, love, friendship, self-love, ambition, pride, humility, and other virtues. Then ensues an analysis of the animus in contrast with what is properly the mind (mens). The animus was said by ancient philosophers to be the soul although the philosophers distinguished between lower and higher principles within the soul. To decide this question, our seer finds it necessary to appeal to an “anatomy” of the mind. The animus, he concludes, is not the soul, nor is it the same as the rational mind, for all purely animal affections and cupidities (i.e., venereal love) are ascribed to it. The animus is never, strictly speaking, rational. Its cupidities or desires die with us. It is an inferior or irrational mind. It does not think and is not the life of the senses; it cannot live in the same manner as the soul. As a lower form it is imperfect.

The higher or rational mind is the form of forms, the principle of all activities in the animus. Yet it has an internal sensory in which it resides, as the animus resides in the brain or common sensory. “For that the mind is in the brain is beyond the possibility of a doubt; the state
of the mind is the state of the brain; they are so far united that whenever the one is injured, languishes, and seems about to die, the other is equally so.”

The mind has an “intellectory” or purest cortical substance, which consists of still more simple substances. These simple substances are what we call the soul (anima). In these substances there is life.

The mind itself is spiritual, while the animus is purely natural. The rational mind intervenes between the soul and the animus. That is, the rational mind is affected--it desires wishes, and, at length, it determines its desires and acts. The rational mind does not derive its essence and life from itself; but through culture, knowledge, and arts. The mind as “superior” or spiritual “flows” in and possesses the rational principle. Hence the rational principle is not properly the mind but is intermediate between the mind and the animus as participating in both.

“For a spiritual mind flows into it from above, and a natural mind or animus from below.” The superior is the life of the thoughts, as the animus is the life of the affections. It is to be noted that in his later psychology Swedenborg retains this classification concerning what he calls the rational mind.

Our seer next studies the formation and affections of the rational mind, emphasizing the loves as perpetually reigning. There is no mind without loves, as indeed, there is no animus without affections. The soul is in brief the life of the intellect. It includes the love of understanding and being wise, of knowing hidden things, the love of knowledges, of truths, and the knowledge of good and evil. It also includes conscience.

The animus is at best a “form whose essential determinations are all those affections which flow in from the body and from the world through the gateway of the senses.” But the spiritual mind is the form whose essential determinations are all those loves which flow in from above or from God through His Spirit by means of the Word, and from heaven and the celestial
society of souls. The spiritual mind is in brief the spirit. The rational mind, receiving its loves both from above and from below, distinguishes man from animals; while the spiritual mind brings him into relationship with God and the realm of spiritual beings in general. The spiritual mind also possesses moral freedom so that the will is able in a measure to act independently of intellect.

The influx of the animus and its affections is into the body and there is an influx of the body into the animus. Swedenborg unqualifiedly adopts the principle of interaction between mind and body. He speaks of the animus as “flowing” into the body, while the body gives form to this influx. So, too, there is an influx of the rational mind into the animus and by means of the animus into the body, and of the animus into the rational. Thus, the influx is reciprocal all the way along. The emphasis falls throughout on the series of influxes and the correspondence between the several mental and spiritual principles.

The discussion includes a study of inclinations and temperaments, immortality, and the state of the soul after death, with an analysis of various views regarding the soul. Thus Swedenborg speaks of the soul which “procreates the form itself of the body and of its parts,” the blood and “animal spirit.” He also discusses the form of the soul in heaven, and inclines to the view that we do not put on the human form, but that souls are like birds, with no need of feet or hands, muscles, or legs. We can no more know what form the soul will occupy than can the silkworm know the guise which it is presently to assume. We are ignorant of the purest aura, called celestial, in which souls are to live. Our future form is not to be such as the present one. For the soul, when no longer connected with organic forms necessary for the pursuit of corporeal life, may put on any form it wishes. It might, for example, descend to earth and take on the human form. For universal nature serves the spiritual life as an instrumental cause.
The soul, “constituted in the freedom of determination,” and no longer limited by the earth, can put off the bodily form assumed for the purposes of existence here and dissipate it in an instant. It can, for instance, present a burning countenance, that of the cherubim and seraphim. The reason for this liberty is found in the fact that the whole form is from the soul. Further, the lower mind becomes wholly extinct. There will then be only pure intellect. The life of the soul will remain as pure intellect, or spiritual essence. Its intelligence will be above all sciences and doctrines, since these are natural. “The soul knows the secret things of those sciences, which can never be penetrated by the mind, although always approached.” There will be no struggle between soul and animus, or between the loves due to these. The soul can know everything which the mind experienced in the body, because its intellect is pure. Its memory will not be that of the mere past, but will be more pure and perfect; in other words, the soul will be occupied with its perpetual intuition of the past and present envisaged at the same time. Souls will be in communication with one another, as indeed we now communicate directly; but the communication will be more immediate, by auras and atmospheres which reach to any distance. Heaven will be the society of happy souls. Divine providence, in universals and particulars, relates to this attainment of a society which is to be the most perfect in form. In short, there are many anticipations of the seer’s later works, with the important distinction that in his *Rational Psychology*, some of the teachings are purely speculative and fanciful. The idea that the soul may occupy any form it wishes, presumably a form like a bird, is wholly set aside in the later period in favor of the form of the human body as invariably the type. But the change from speculation to the deliverances of spiritual perception was not made until after the transition was complete.

Here, our seer’s speculative period somewhat abruptly ends, as he forgoes all attempts to complete his quest for the soul by appeal to anatomical studies and external research.
Accordingly, he devotes himself through prayer and the adoption of new rules of life to the more
direct means of spiritual perception and passes through a religious conversion to the
interpretation of the Scriptures. He does not give up his methods of painstaking research. Nor
does he lay aside the principles which have guided him in trying to envisage the totality of the
soul’s relationships. But the opening of his spiritual sight is such that he now finds himself in
assured possession of that which before was often a matter of inference. Granted his intromission
into these realities, after two years of transitional struggle amidst experiences that were far from
intelligible at the time, we are now to be concerned with the general principles of the new
perspective. For knowledge of this later psychology is essential to any effort to account for so
great a change.

When our seer realized that his work was not the quest of the soul as such, but the
systematic discovery of the inner meaning of portions of the Bible, he put aside all books except
the Hebrew and Latin texts and gave himself resolutely to his new work. As everything in the
natural world had become for him a sign or symbol of spiritual realities by the principle of
correspondence, so now we find him absorbed in the idea that the words of the text contain a
truth corresponding to the letter. This inner meaning becomes, in turn, the clue to the spiritual
history of man and that history a disclosure of the real nature of the soul. Not until matters were
put in this light did he come into full possession of the soul as a discerned reality, in contrast
with his groping toward it from the viewpoint of anatomy and physiology. We are to follow this
procedure by taking our clue from statements made here and there in the theological works, first
considering the essential principles of Swedenborg’s later doctrine, and then the law of
correspondence and the doctrine of influx, without which we can hardly see the meaning of the
new perspective.
Chapter 3
Universal Principles

Swedenborg’s rational psychology was corrected during his illumination period by carrying forward ideas that proved highly applicable so that the teaching of the one period became the sure convictions of the other. As the tentative psychology was based on a world-view by appeal to facts of the special sciences, so the later doctrine involved a view of the universe which we need to consider in brief before seeing in what sense the new viewpoint is a corrective. The universe is now enlarged to include the spiritual world in its entirety, while the psychology becomes the science of the soul in the light of two-world experience.

It is not easy to adopt a viewpoint so extensive, accustomed as we are to stop where physics leaves us, with the phenomena of light, heat, and electricity; or where astronomy leaves us with the stars and planets in a region too vast to penetrate. Moreover, every word we use, every figure of speech, the whole structure of thought by which we try to penetrate life’s final meaning, is taken from objects in space and time. By contrast, we are now asked to try a great adventure: to picture the higher background of the soul by starting as resolutely as we can above space and time, so that we may look upon our natural habitat as subordinate to the spiritual.

The larger view begins to come before us with the idea of God as universal Love and Wisdom. These qualities are not to be thought of as vague entities, but as determinate Essence-substances embodying the reality, the law, order, system of the universe, including the seemingly rigid reality of the “eternal hills” and the widespread reality of the shining sea. Love and Wisdom as creative first principles of the universe are more real than nature with its apparently
fixed structure and permanent material substances, its mighty forces, with the lightning-flash and the fierce sweep of the hurricane. Therefore, the term *essence* means that Love is more real than “substance” ordinarily implies. The Divine essence gives substance and form to all natural and spiritual things. Love and Wisdom are, in brief, Substance and Form as such, enduring eternally and not subject to the changes that come and go in material forms and substances. Again, Love is both essence and energy, the total dynamic of the universal, underlying all natural forces as ostensibly unchangeable.13

Perhaps we can most readily identify the greater idea of God with terms now familiar if we first speak of Him as transcendent, beyond definition in finite terms, as Being-in-itself (*Esse*), that from which all things are, the First and Last, Beginning and End.14 *Esse* signifies substance in the sense of subsistent Being, not dependent on any prior substance and form; hence, Life, Love, Wisdom, each in-itself. So, we forgo the ancient effort in trying to penetrate farther and farther back to an apparent first cause *in time* until we come to a stopping-place. Instead, our thought *begins* with the Reality which is prior to all that is temporally substantial in causal sequences. God as *Esse*, transcendent, already involves *Existere*, God going forth into manifestation, taking form.15 These related terms imply all Divine origins in their unity, Love being more explicitly Divine essence than Wisdom.16

Not until we have thus dwelt on the idea of God as Love, and secondarily, Wisdom and Life coming from Love, are we prepared for the idea of God as Creator of the universe. For no one can be immediately created from pure Essence. On the transcendent or infinite side, God in His immensity is above all space and, in His eternity, above all time.17 But when we think of creation we may rightfully think of God’s life or power as a sphere, as a first step in the finiting process. Then we may think of God as present in space “without” or above it, and present in time
although “without time.” This statement gives the clue to all thought of God as omnipresent or immanent in nature without any confusion between God and the natural world.

When creating, God “rendered His infinity finite by means of substances emitted from Himself, from which His nearest surrounding sphere . . . came into existence.”\(^1\)\(^8\) Therefore we should not think of created things as separated from Him. This finiting proceeded by degrees so that things became more and more finite, each in its place in the gradation or descent. We cannot conceive of, or visualize immensity, but we may realize that it is different from the given space which we identify with our earth, and the more we bring down our thoughts to the objects around us, the more we consider minute details, such as the space which a certain book in a certain room may be said to occupy. So too, we may pass in thought from eternity to the present moment. Again, we may turn in thought from the spiritual to the natural, finally coming to the unyielding rock which, for the moment, seems much more substantial than love or wisdom.

Yet while for purposes of clear thinking, we discriminate even to the minutest point, declaring that God is neither the present moment, nor the book in the room, or the rock on the hill, we constantly remind ourselves that no created thing was ever summoned into existence as if wrought out of nothing by a wonder-worker, by miraculous appearance in a void. Creation as “of” and “from” God was brought into being from Love and Wisdom so that the created products embodied and manifested the Divine essence. Created things then are \(\textit{real},\) although less real than their Creator. Spiritual things are more real and enduring than their counterparts in the natural world. Man, as the highest created being, was wrought in the Divine image and likeness; this means, above all, the image and likeness of Love and Wisdom. Here is the basic idea of the psychology.
Hence, in our thought about man, we proceed from the idea of God to the idea of the human spirit, without first indulging in the imagery of space and time as if thinking of the physical body, produced during a given number of years. We may, in brief, move from Love-Wisdom in God to will-understanding in the human spirit. Keeping this basis or viewpoint in mind, we shall avoid much confusion. The reasons for making this distinction so explicit become clear when we consider the nature of spiritual thought, or “thought with a spiritual idea.” Such thought starts with what we may call the open world of freely moving insight. The natural world, by contrast, is for most of us a closed world, hedged in by our immediate environment, limited by our material occupations, confined by bodily habits, and restricted by physical inheritance. The natural world is closed, too, because we persist in mistaking the body for the soul, in thinking by means of bondages instead of our freedom and immersing ourselves in activities down near the earth instead of lifting our thoughts to the skies.

In the open world of the spiritual life man is a child of God, wrapped around with the Divine presence, with no barriers between. If a figure from the spatial world can in any measure suggest this untrammeled insight, we may compare its activities to the free motions of a bird in its graceful, rhythmic flight, sweeping about unhampered, without friction or resistance due to the medium in which it flies. But existence in this, the closed world of our natural activities, holds us down to determinate bodily relations. The functions we perform leave us weary. The efforts we make arouse resistance. We must constantly replenish our energies. Our existence is almost entirely dedicated to “nature-processes,” as Adolph Roeder has called them. It is difficult for us even to imaging a spiritual function as a process which neither eats into the substance of the soul nor exhausts the energies from the spiritual world in which the soul participates. But
however difficult the venture, this effort to envisage the soul in its essence is the whole of our
study in quest of the spirit with its functions in relation to the physical body with its processes.**

In spirit man moves and wills, thinks, and understands from the Divine life which in itself
is open and free. In and through the body, man loves by means of sensibilities, thinks and wills
through the brain, and moves or acts by aid of the body’s structure as an organic whole. Were he
in perfect possession of his spiritual faculties, he would possess the open vision of spiritual
perception. Most of us are greatly hampered by bodily conditions in the closed world of
existence in the flesh, and where we value things above spiritual truths, pursuing wealth and
personal pleasures. Hence the need for a profound teaching to enlighten us concerning the
falsities and other obscurities which limit both our vision and our affections.

These appearances envelop our minds like a succession of clouds. Through these mists
the spirit must try to think. If we could see with perfect clarity what a spirit-function is, how
spirit operates by participating in the influent Divine life, we would then be able to see how the
spiritual life might become dominant, so that each mental process and every bodily response
would serve heavenly standards. This vision would disclose spirit-functions and bodily processes
in unison. We could then see from actual insight what correspondence is; how influx imbues
spirit, mind, and body, in succession; why psychological states are in series; and why in
descrating soul and body, we should never confuse spirit-functions as constituting one degree
with nature-functions constituting a lower degree.

In the following chapters we shall take up each of these terms as nearly as possible by
itself. But we first needed the imagery of the open world in order to picture what is in process in
the closed world of psychophysical relations where things look as if they were self-operative. We

** Dresser is referring to Adolph Roeder, a Swedenborgian and author of *Handbook of the Science of
Correspondences* (1894), *Unconscious Education* (1889), *Light in the Clouds, Being Glimpses of the Inner Word*
(1925), and *Man’s Two Memories; A Study of Emanuel Swedenborg’s Teachings Concerning Them* (1931).
Note especially that from the spiritual (open) world come all the activities which not only produce but sustain us as natural beings, sustain us when sleeping as well as when vigorously awake. No bodily process, such as nutrition, the flow of blood to the brain, the coming and going of sleep, is ever a cause of the energy it uses. All causes are invariably spiritual in minutest detail. All efficiency or life functioning toward ends is from the spiritual world as the realm of Divine purposes. Nature is the realm of effects. Every process or change, even in the finest details, is a consequence of its spiritual counterpart, to which it corresponds by precise law. We may compare it to an uttered sentence and bodily deed expressing man’s motive in speaking and acting. To grasp this law of constant dependence of physical events and things on the spiritual causes of which external things are counterparts, is to understand the central principle which we shall take up point by point as we study one function or faculty after another. Given the contrast between cause and effect, we shall be ready to picture the perpetual flowing of Divine life from the spiritual world into the natural as the demonstration of what has been called the immanence of God. We are invited to envisage this great in-streaming as portrayed by one whose vision disclosed man’s natural life like an open book.

We can hardly follow this description, however, unless we realize that the explanation thus given of man’s mental life is not a product of separate analysis but a part of the system of doctrine as a whole; starting with the idea of God, which gives the clue to the idea of man, thus to the nature of spirit in man, his mind, his experience, and his relation to the physical world. For there is a descent of principles from beginning to end, from firsts to lasts. Insight into the process of descent is essential to knowledge of any chapter in the long history of man’s ascent from lower to higher. “Nothing can spring from itself, but only from something prior to itself; therefore all things spring from a First . . . the very Being (Esse) of the life of all things.”

God
as the First, as source, cause, life, efficiency, substance, is the ground of all existence; both the essence and the power which go forth as creative and sustaining Spirit; both Creator and Lord; both the first Reality and the imbuing purpose in all manifestations. Hence, as in other systems of thought which seek an absolute basis, the appeal is to the immutable First Principle. Since nothing in the created universe can subsist from itself, or from another which in turn subsists from another and thus on to infinity in a series, there is a First in which all things are. The First is Essence-Life. The sustaining power is as essential as creation itself. For things continue to exist in a state of complete dependence, by means of intermediates, each of which implies the First.

The same principle would be implied, and the same reasoning would follow whatever term we might select as the clue. We might start our thought of the universe by appeal to unities and forms. We would then see the impossibility of unity without form. For the form makes the “one” or unit. To exist as a distinctive thing is to possess form. To exist through form is to possess power to accomplish an end, and without such power things could not be real. Man is a form, entity or unit in this sense. The created universe is such a created form. “But in order that each and all things may be forms, it is necessary that He who created all things should be Form itself.”
Chapter 5
The Sphere of Manifestation

Our first study of universal principles yielded a vision of created things descending from infinite Form to finite forms, from the First to what follows in the Divine Order, to the last or outermost. Bearing this vision of mind, starting always with the Divine “proceeding,” and going forth in eternity before entering the sphere of time, we may consider immeasurable reality before we consider space. Thus, we may think by functions and purposes, avoiding undue stress on processes and things, or events in process. To keep this approach throughout is to regard the created universe of spiritual and natural worlds as a manifestation of the Divine Order.

The term “manifestation,” as here used by way of interpretation, signifies the expression of what is substantial. Thus, the natural world is the embodiment of the spiritual which, as prior, more directly manifests Love and Wisdom. The natural world is not a mere “show” or phenomenon, an illusion, or dream. It represents in definite forms, types, modes of activity existing in a series, each with its distinctive place and purpose, the Divine plan of creation, the types of descent and ascent being related by successive degrees. Therefore, any description is to be avoided which involves an idea of blending, as color gives place to color through intervening shades in the spectrum. The outgoing creative process from inner to outer, or spirit to matter, preserves all that is characteristic of the human spirit as fit for immortal life, matter being temporal and subordinate, never able to lift itself to become spirit, although matter in its appropriate place is “real.”21
What is interior tends to become exterior in the most external forms and substances. The successive planes of descent derive their impetus through what is most interior. The ascent towards God is invariably a responsive process due to the efficiency which called it into existence, never as a mere revolt against matter or outer darkness, as if reactivity were native to matter. The degrees and orders of manifestation which descend from the First are actuated by the creative outpouring which adapts each to receive and to give, but without yielding what is distinctive to its type. So too, in the ascent the efficiency is still from Spirit, however evident the mere appearance that there is a cumulative impetus gathered from the material world, as if matter had become creative. Motion, for example, is first from Spirit; it is not an original cosmic force supposedly dwelling in matter from the beginning. The body of man is formed through the spirit, to be its representative and instrument; it did not instinctively fashion itself, as if it could acquire functions and dictate to spirit. The relationship is never by interfusion of energies or substances. The spirit does not lose quality by contact with the body.

Since the spiritual world is the realm of causes, and the natural world a realm of effects, all causality, even in the minutest details of the relationship of mind and brain, is due to the forth-going principle as already indicated, never to any alleged efficacy of the one series of states as if producing the corresponding series in the other. For the creative principle is without exception. Nothing whatever occurs in human experience on any plane without a cause from the spiritual world. Consequently, nothing in man’s existence can be adequately described or intelligibly interpreted save in the light of this causal relation. The spiritual clothes itself (is divinely clothed) with its natural garment for special reasons, so that the body shall be explicitly an instrument for purposes of manifestation or expression.
The relationship is therefore dynamic or vital, not in the mechanical sense in which these terms are used today, as if the dynamic of nature were physical energy only; but dynamic as a sign of the presence of Spirit, vital as indicating that the energy is alive because the Spirit imbues it. Again, the dynamic of the world is always in the relation already indicated: from higher to lower, taking on successive forms. The purpose reigning in all forms of energy and all modes of substance adapts them to their distinctive places and planes, so that one essence is everywhere manifest, and one law unifies the whole Divine Order. All things proceed toward ends. All existent things in the mineral, vegetable, and animal spheres occupy specific places in the total system and have a certain use.

All things existing through cause, end, and use, exist for a purpose in the Divine economy. Spiritual reality through its manifestation fits itself for its objectives. Hence the created universe, a “work coherent as a unit,” is a “complex” of purposes existing in a “successive order.” The universe as a whole consists of “perpetual uses” brought forth by Wisdom but initiated into activity by Love. It is thus briefly summarized as the embodiment of Divine purposes. The manifesting form is wholly subservient to the purpose which brought it into being. The formative Divine life is in all things as their beginnings and continuations. The creative purpose is more than a “plan” by which a thing is made according to design. It is a vitalizing or imbuing process. The creative Life, resistant with all things in the impulses which actuate them, is especially resistant in man when he fulfills the ends for which he was called into being.

As the universe in its totality goes forth from God as its eternal Ground, so each created thing goes forth from the First, with a like impetus to attain what is last or outermost. The First is thus “inmostly in all progression,” the image of the Infinite and Eternal, and is in the variety of
That which makes one thing different from another is the same principle which gives it an impetus to become as outwardly expressive as possible. The differences between things are not then due either to heredity or environment, to the conflict of inner forces or the interplay of external forces, such as those implied in climate, weather, or the struggle for physical existence in the animal kingdom. Neither the genus nor the species, neither the individual differences nor the varieties are due to chance. For purpose reigns all the way along. Hence, man is never what we find him to be because of external events, accidents, or any incidents which seemingly interfere with creation.

This is another way of saying that nothing in the natural world is intelligible by itself, as if it were a cause. Since nothing exists without connection with what is active in the spiritual world, not even historical events in their summation yield a complete story of man’s contacts with reality. The reason is that God “acts upon all things of man,” and all these are in such intimacy of connection, and through this connection in such a form, that the elements of man’s nature do not act as many, but as one, the “one” which must always be regarded from within and above. The term “accidental” and “causal” are idle words, indeed, if we assume that mere things never shape man into the being we find he actually is in any instance directly before us. Since man is a spirit, his attitude of affection towards life always enters the account; thus, his actual interior state, what he was, what he is, and what he may be through his responses both to events which might make or mar him from the outside and to internal sequences eliciting his prevailing love.

Furthermore, maintenance involves perpetual creation, a permanent springing-forth from the creative Ground of all manifestation. There is a persistent movement toward the ends which Divine Providence is pursuing in our lives, even though we are wholly unmindful of it. This
present, ever-renewed impetus is as important for all practical purposes as the standard according to which we were originally created, as we realize when we consider our relationship to it in terms of the Divine Influx. For the casual movement by which we live is constant. We are dependent on it from moment to moment. It does not merely actuate us for near-by ends but enlists our cooperation for the final objective of humans as a whole in the heavenly society which is to be. Yet the Lord leads us by freedom, never coercing or compelling anyone, guiding as well as permitting, ever responsive to any effort we may make which can be turned to productive account in His eternal purpose. Hence, we need doctrinally to know how Divine Providence is present within us at large in order to understand even the minor phases of our mental life in the immediate present. The Lord is present with every man, “urging and pressing” him, so that He may be received. He is present unceasingly, even when man is immersed in the hell of self-love in its most intense form. This indwelling tender care of Divine Providence is the primary consideration.

Reiteration of these principles is essential to our study in order to bring out the elaborate thoroughness of the doctrine in minutest detail, and to guard against all misconceptions due to other viewpoints. Any possible appearance, for example, however remote from or seemingly alien to its eternal Ground, is intelligible on the same basis of gradations in the sphere of manifestation. There is the primary truth, for instance, that man as spirit is more real than his body, more spiritual thought than natural thought; and there is the secondary truth that man construes his existence according to his spiritual status and mental development. For the most part, man lives in semblances, hiding his motives, putting on the masquerades of materiality. Our psychology, to be complete, must then take account of a two-fold relationship: (1) that of our spiritual being in this gradational environment which includes the Divine purpose for us both
here and hereafter; and (2) that of our ordinary conscious activity in a series of appearances more or less remote from ideal adjustment to the Divine in-streaming through which we exist. The clue which simplifies this apparent complexity is found in two types of love running throughout human existence: love of self and the world, and love toward the Lord and man.

Existing beings and things are distinctive not alone through various planes and types according to the implied “degrees,” but the tendency of all life to individuate or incarnate itself in outermost forms. Thus, the Word, becoming flesh and dwelling among us, as well as in the text of Scripture, exemplifies the universal process. The spiritual principle is literally in its form, the whole truth finds revelation in the letter. Whether we are considering incarnation with reference to personality or in relation to truth, the principle is the same. Thus, God as the “Lord” signifies the Divine individuating principle. The theology of this system, like the psychology discerned through a study of the Word, and perceived through insight into the human spirit, is an instance of a general principle. To spiritual insight, the visible universe is a system of projected laws and principles, so that the inner can be read in the outer. The design exemplified in the universe before us is seen in miniature in the spirit and body of individual man. Man, in turn, individuates himself in his deeds, incarnates his will in specific acts, and portrays his emotions in particular responses to life’s situations. Hence the psychology is a specific chapter in the all-embracing history of Spirit in form, matter, the spiritual and the natural worlds.

Any external process is thus a result only. This is notably true of an alleged beginning such as the “original impetus of life” sometimes assumed to underlie all modes of cosmical energy, the “will-to-live” or any equivalent “instinct” or “urge” supposedly prior to the impulses actuating us in the experiences which we all know. No stimulus is any more spontaneous than the genus or the species by which animal organisms are fitted to environment. The visible world
as a realm of effects is nowhere so intelligible as in its unity in terms of the two principles which
in the foregoing, we at first considered separately: first the Divine purpose, including cause, end,
and use; and then, the individuating activity which finds its highest instance in the Word made
flesh in Scripture as revelation. The perfect type is exemplified, although no man, no race or
nation as such could achieve it. Man is never so separate as that, either apart from his fellow men
or apart from his God. The Lord incarnate is Man in perfect form, the “heaven from the human
race,” the highest destiny of the Divine humanity. Hence, as we shall see in a later chapter, the
psychology takes its cue from both the standard of man-the-individual and from the social type.

The life of man in all its phases, from innocence and childhood to wisdom and maturity,
is as surely a consequence, never an originating cause, as in any instances of natural
development. Since nature mounts to higher forms because so created, so mind in nature mounts,
mind imbues body, the spirit in-fills the organism, the ascending process always being due to the
higher modes of life, never to the lower. Because the Lord is by nature Love and Wisdom in
reciprocal union so that Love is dominant in the universe, there are in man corresponding
faculties, so ordered that Love is central.27 Because the Lord is Love, while His Wisdom is “of
that Love,” man is created to be an image of Him through Wisdom.

The “fact” for psychology (that man is will and understanding) follows from the truth
concerning spiritual reality. In the Lord the unity of principles is a unity of Life, in man the unity
is through reciprocity of the two faculties for receiving Life. Man can know (by doctrine) the
basis of the two-foldness of his nature, although the spiritual forms constituting his nature in
large measure transcend his apprehension. The central dynamic is love, even though this source
is hidden within the affections through which this love takes form. This is the underlying truth in
psychology, even when for the time being the emphasis falls on correspondence, influx, or degrees.

The forms of the two faculties approach nearer our apprehension when it is a question of their basis in the brain where are found the beginnings of the fibers through which the forces flow into external deeds. For here we come to the more accessible region where these forces cause the senses to be present in the sensories, the movements in the moving parts, and the various bodily functions to proceed. These secondary matters are produced from principles primary to them according to the same laws which we have been considering. Hence, everything in mind and body is in intimate relation. Mental life is thus explicable by the equipment which man brings to experience. His spiritual organization makes experience possible, not the cerebral organization which spirit uses, as important as that organism may be. What is impressed on man by physical contact is secondary to what he habitually tends to become.

Since life is not creatable, it is due in all its modes to the inmost activity of Love-Wisdom imbuing man by influx, sustaining him in the unbroken present. This is activity-in-itself, in contrast with what seems to be man’s life when bodily processes are analyzed. Man is not even the originator of the organizing activities of the intellect by which the items of experience fall into their places; rather, he is a “form” organized to receive impressions and respond to knowledges from without and within. The principal cause is always the actuating life. Man’s mind is an instrumental cause only, with recipient forms which in a measure shape his experience according to his type; for despite all this emphasis on universality, identity, law and order, no two minds are exactly alike. Indeed, no man’s affections or perceptions are so alike another’s as to be the same as his. Hence, each is to be judged by what he is as an internal man
by noting the individuality, attitude, characteristic thought, will, and love. Meanwhile, the Divine life also tends to what is individual in each person.

Thus, the whole relationship of inner and outer factors in man’s life is an instance of the universal as related to the individual, and the general to the particular. As man’s life is in general, so it is in the minutest details of effort, intention, and will. Thus, a haughty man impresses his haughtiness upon all modes of conduct manifesting his character. A covetous man shapes his mind in thought, word, deed, by what he covets. A stupid man discloses his stupidity in all phases of his thought and will. Every man has a general state which rules the particulars of his mentality. In fine, man has for his end that which he most loves. The quality of the external deed follows from the quality of its deeper motive, whatever the concealments offered.29 Human conduct is reducible to types, types of motives, and thus to the ruling love, as in case of love to the neighbor, even though the doer, in self-effacing humility, directs attention away from himself as much as possible.

The quality of a man is the characteristic by which he would be known were he already in heaven, with his deficiencies made manifest, but with the true measure of his faith and charity unmistakably disclosed. In his sincerest thought, man thinks from his real quality. Again, goods and truths have quality according to his life. The Lord appears to each according to his quality.30 For a man’s quality bespeaks whatever is within him in the profoundest sense, the quality of each being different. In every degree of man’s nature, the inflowing goods are qualified according to the reception of what is thus given. Even Love and Wisdom are received amid this qualifying responsiveness. Hence the general activity in man is Divine-human. Within man, in turn, spirit-functions come first in order, then nature-functions imbuing bodily processes in the realm of counterparts. Obviously, the limitations or qualifications are less potent in the interiors, and more
influential in the exteriors in proportion as man’s life is absorbed in mere externals. Given these
general principles, with the contrast between the open world of the spiritual vision and the closed
world of man’s natural-mindedness, we have the outlines of an essentially spiritual psychology.
Chapter 5

Perception

The term perception is commonly used to designate the next process higher than sensation. Psychology shows us that nobody, unless it be the newborn infant, ever experiences sensation as such. What we experience, even when we discriminate a quality so simple as “red” in contrast with “blue,” where there is a wealth of things present in the field of vision before us, is perception of an object partly described or explained as red or blue among other qualities characteristic of it. Perception often involves a point of view, and sometimes an illusion for which allowance must be made, as in a bent staff seen in a pool. We frequently dispute over what is “out there” in space for everybody to see. We try to reconstruct objects in behalf of our discriminations, based on various experiences commonly classified under the head of sense-perception. Ordinary knowledge goes little further than this.

In Swedenborg’s psychology the term perception does double duty, according to the degree or plane on which perception becomes active. It is used in the ordinary sense just mentioned. It is also used in a very different connection, as a spirit-function which has no dependence on items of sense-experience supplied by the external world. This higher function is spiritual perception, inclusive of what may be called celestial insight, or direct vision of celestial and spiritual realities. Celestial insight is the highest vision possible to the human spirit. It discloses what is real in such clarity that explanation by analysis and synthesis is no longer necessary. It is intuition in its best estate, if by intuition we mean immediate apprehension in a
synthetic or unifying process which puts the spirit within the reality or truth signified. It is open 
vision; hence it is a higher degree of discernment than that grasping of principles which falls 
short of intimate touch with their Divine reality. We shall use the term “spiritual perception” to 
cover this whole field of direct apprehension, and use “intuition” as a synonym of such 
perception when intuition is understood to be a higher degree of insight. Spiritual perception is, 
in brief, intuition of principles and truths discerned without limitations of space and time. We 
have first to consider the nature of sense-perception.

Through the senses the organism is brought into contact with the world around as a given 
matter of fact. The significance of these external relations, temporal and spatial, is that by their 
aid we can distinguish one thing from another. Sense-perception is that activity in us through 
which we become aware of and identify these temporal and spatial relations. Thus we 
discriminate between the small and the great, the few and the many, quantity from quality, and 
one quantity or quality from another. Thus, too, we come to know the difference between (1) 
sense-experiences which we refer to objects in external relation to the bodily organism, such as 
chairs, pictures on the wall, the distant hills, sounds, odors and smells; and (2) sense-perceptions 
which we refer to processes and conditions within the body, notably in the brain, where sense-
perception is localized.

Based on these discriminations we are able to select for practical purposes those states 
which we can control, because they are within the organism, in contrast with those states over 
which we have no power, such as heat and cold, light and darkness, due to changes in the natural 
world. Time, for instance, is identified with the rotation of the earth on its axis, and by the 
advance from one position to another along the zodiac. Hence come distinctions into day and 
night, morning and noon, and the four seasons. Our perception of space is due, objectively
speaking, to the fact that our globe, with its various kinds of matter, is extended, has volume, parts, and measurable distances. Nobody would think of attributing these tangible qualities to a mere succession of dream-like processes within our consciousness.

The point to emphasize in the present description is that this sense-perception as a process is explained from within rather than from without. It used to be said that there is no subject-matter in the intellect which was not first in the senses; knowledge derived through sensation was regarded as the only original knowledge. But in the present teaching all knowledge is referred to as influx; it is only secondarily due to sensation, even in the case of natural knowledge. Spiritual knowledge is always due to higher sources.

Even in the most commonplace experiences by which we distinguish an object near at hand, such as a table, from one that is afar, sense-perception involves understanding. To understand is in fact to “view from the sight of the mind,” to explain the relationships of things and distinguish fact from illusion. By aid of reason we distinguish illusion or delusion from an actual object seen under normal conditions. When we realize that perception in general is “mental view from higher to lower” by influx, we need not dwell on the inferior phases of the process. The eye, for example, does not see an object distinguished by comparison with other objects; sense-perception apprehends through the eye.

So, too, in all intellectual processes there is an activity by which we consider, discern, and understand by virtue of a higher principle. By experience we know the difference between a clear and an obscure perception of doctrine, and the details and principles pertaining to it. We are aware of a certain clarity of perception when the doctrine is true, in contrast with obscurity when a doctrine is false. Through clear discernment we distinguish truth from interpretation, then develop this truth in successive moments of thought, putting it in contrast with other teachings.
This perception of truth is primarily due to our love for it.\textsuperscript{35} A perception that is genuine enables the understanding to think about the matter in question as it really is, by internal acceptance or ascent.

Our immediate interest is to note that we apprehend objects of sense-perception by stages. When it is said that objects of the world “enter through the eye,” storing themselves up in the memory, “evidently under a like visual shape,” the reference is to the initial stage or appearance.\textsuperscript{36} Through clear discernment we distinguish truth from interpretation, then develop this truth in successive moments of thought, putting it in contrast with other teachings. This perception of truth is primarily due to our love for it.\textsuperscript{37} A perception that is genuine enables the understanding to think about the matter in question as it really is, by internal acceptance or ascent.

Our immediate interest is to note that we apprehend objects of sense-perception by stages. When it is said that objects of the world “enter through the eye,” storing themselves up in the memory,” “evidently under a like visual shape,” the reference is to the initial stage or appearance.\textsuperscript{38} We infer the “like visual shape” from the fact that the objects as reproduced are seen within, that is, ideationally. This is obviously a higher process. Again, when these objects appear still more interiorly, they represent thought, which in turn is a still higher process; for it is not until the higher light enters the object that our objects appear representatively and correspondently.\textsuperscript{39}

Apparently, objects “move the senses,” first the external, then the internal. “It appears as if the objects of sight, which affect the eyes, inflow into the thought and produces it.”\textsuperscript{40} But this is fallacy. For the internal “sensates” (functions) through the external sense; it “disposes the external sensory to receive objects according to its beck.”\textsuperscript{41} The senses at once accommodate
themselves to all objects according to their quality. This could not be unless there where an influx from the interior. Objects as existent in the world are material, or “dead.” The sensuous principle of the mind receives the objects from the world. The higher processes follow. Eventually we can think of objects in their full relationships. Thus, given the appearance of a house in front, seen from a distance, we reconstruct the sides and back, and estimate its distance from us. The total sense-perception is mostly a work of the higher processes of the mind.

The part played by perception may be illustrated by pleasures. We experience various sorts of pleasure, associated with touch, tastes, and odors; and because these pleasures are felt in the body we call them pleasures of the body. Yet “no pleasure ever exists in the body unless it exists and subsists from an interior affection.”\textsuperscript{42} The pleasures are really the external effects of interior processes which we do not see if we live in the body. But in the other life, these interiors unfold and present themselves to perception and, what is unknown while man was asleep, immersed in corporeal things, becomes manifest. Then the illusions fall away. Thus disappears, for example, the notion that the eye can see; for it becomes plain that unless there were interior sight no eye could ever see. With the death of the body, man sees as well as before, even better than when he lived in the body. It then becomes plain that it is the interior sight which, through the eye, apprehends the things which the eye apparently sees as if by itself.\textsuperscript{43} To explain sight as a bodily process, apparently independent or all-sufficient, we need then to presuppose the internal sight which is \textit{perceptive}.\textsuperscript{44} In the perceptual sense, the internal sight discerns the external; interior things can see what is exterior. The interior sight, or sight of the spirit, has a wider range, and includes perception of the things which appear in the other life. So, too, the perception of Divine ideas does not stop with the objects disclosed to sight, but constantly sees from and in the external that which is internal.\textsuperscript{45}
Perception is thus seen to cover a wide range through the advance from sense-perception in this life, to intellectual perception as some of us already know it, to spiritual perception as very few know it; and then come the much more extensive experiences in the other life which disclose the things of which we are oblivious in the natural world. Intellectual perception passes through stages such that it becomes progressively interior the nearer we approach its actual nature. In our ordinary intellectual processes, we examine facts, consider their meaning, discern laws, and acquire understanding of principles. To advance beyond the mere acquisition of principles by appeal to memory-knowledges is to grow into insight. Granted intellectual insight, we are at least on the borders of spiritual perception; and we know the difference between this clarifying process and the duller activities of ordinary thought.

Thus, love of truth as a motive comes progressively into the foreground. So too, an awareness of obligation enters in, for instance, when we see that the Golden Rule is a principle which applies to all mankind and ought to be obeyed by all men. To give assent is to adopt the principle as true. This assent, spiritually regarded, is “a dictate through heaven from the Lord, inflowing into the interiors of thought.” When perception, thus understood in relation to influx, and the dictate Divinely instilled which gives it authority above that of ordinary knowledge exists, it is said to be spiritual, and it belongs to the distinctive degree in the scale of knowledge and truth. As celestial, perception ranks still higher in authority. In general, perception as spiritual discloses matters with certainty which are far from certain on the planes of ordinary knowledge. It includes those convictions which we associate with “the heart.” Thus, man perceives that he will live after death, and he knows this for a certainty applying to mankind. This certainty is intuitive, in contrast with the assurance accompanying rational inferences and assumptions. This perception does not depend on external facts or on any external consideration.
It is not in any sense a product of inference. As an intuition, it implies a higher faculty than that of the intellect as commonly understood. Such perception is dependent on the interior development which a man has attained.

While it is our rational nature which yields this penetrative understanding, the light of heaven falling into the mind to produce “illustration” is the real efficiency. The interior intellectual process is all that we are likely to be aware of by experience. The higher factors elude us. But we may supply these in part indirectly by reminding ourselves that it is always the perceptual element which makes a truth or principle real. Other people may give us the benefit of their views or experiences, but there is a very different tang or tone when we ourselves have lived through and seen things for ourselves. This “mental view” (intuition) by which we compare our own experiences with those of others, our own grasp of truth with the utterances of others, is a kind of inner detachment by which we look down as it were upon what we have passed through, as if our experiences were on a plane below our insight into them. To enlarge upon this inner perception, and behold it as more and more widely inclusive, is to realize at least dimly what spiritual perception discloses, and how it is that the light of heaven falls into the mind by an inward way.

Thus, too, the perception of truth is superior in process and higher in type than learning by formulated doctrine. This perception comes by an inward way, whereas knowledge acquired through doctrine comes by an external process. There may, indeed, be a dim perception of spiritual truth when the mind is turned in its direction from an external point of view. But this is as darkness when compared with interior perception from spiritual truth. The so-called certainties which many of us take for truth are inferior indeed to the intuition from the Lord, which shows beyond all question what is good and what is true. The contrast is even more
emphatic in terms of goodness than with respect to truth. For the Divine life, which by inflowing, yields the insight, gives intelligence and wisdom, is determined by the type or quality of goodness. Goodness, thus regarded, is higher in rank than the knowledge which man has of it. As the life of love, so the perceptive faculty. Perception in this sense is internal enlightenment that a matter is “thus and so.”

As the description ascends the scale, it approaches the level of that perception which is known as spiritual sight due to actual opening of the spiritual eyes, in contrast with intellectual perception without such vision. When the spiritual eyes are closed, the veiling of the interior sense is due to the fact that man’s sight is limited to the perception of objects in the material world. When the spiritual eyes are open, there is sight in the spirit, the sight of the spirit being so opened that all Divine truths appear in a form of “representations,” a term to be explained later. With this sight comes the internal dictate concerning truth and heavenly reality, also sight into the inner experiences through which man is passing. Perception in this higher sense depends so intimately on the type of love attained that it is described as celestial only when celestial love of truth and reality prevails. Conjunction with what is celestially real makes this insight possible. On this the highest level of the interior life, celestial vision and inmost revelation are identical.

The Word is the crown of the entire process of such revelation, its purpose being that nearness of approach to God which makes influx of love and wisdom from Him most intimately possible. The clarity of this vision is appreciable by reference to that primeval state of the human spirit when man was still free from the perversions and obscurities due to his absorption in externals. Perception was then internal speech, also. Those who possess celestial perception know, too, that their wisdom is from the Lord; hence, they understand that seeing God depends on love toward Him. Thus, discerning the nature of love by what it accomplishes, they also
realize in what sense faith is spiritual sight. They are no less keenly aware of their own finitude; for even when the human spirit is most exalted the finiteness of the human mind is made apparent, and analytical thought is seen in the light of its limitations.51

Looking at perception due to heavenly light from the point of view of what it discloses, we find that it shows what is true and good, what is from the Lord and what from self; hence, it discloses the individual’s quality. As continual from the Lord, it is higher than continuous revelation without insight into its processes, higher than anything “implanted,” higher than knowledge of truth from principles previously revealed; hence, it yields inmost revelation of principles as such. As revelation from perception, it is the clue to all modes of revelation, as we shall analyze them in another chapter. The highest disclosure of its perfect clarity is Divine Love, coupled with an assurance congruous with Divine principles in general, and yielding daily corroborations of its verity. It might not be strictly correct to say that this insight is beyond reason, yet this much follows: “The more they reason the less they perceive,” as in the case of men seeking spiritual insight as a self-conscious attainment. We might add that this insight is intelligibility itself, without which neither revelation nor formulated doctrine would be understood.

To possess perception at its best, therefore, is to win the principle from which thought itself proceeds, henceforth to “think from perception.” We understand then why it is said that “they who are in perception think from no other source; but still perception is different from thought.”52 Perception in this sense is, of course, a culmination in contrast with its two lesser degrees, defined as “natural” and “rational.” Again, there is (1) thought without conscience; (2) thought from conscience; and (3) thought from perception, given only on the celestial plane as the most internal thought ever vouchsafed to man. This perceptive thought in celestial light is so
surely from the Lord that to think contrary to it would be impossible. Indeed, the celestial man cannot think save from perception.

Inmost perception is from presence, yielding insight into all things below it. Nothing is discerned by spaces and times, but by principles or truths. Hence, it becomes clear why and how perception in any sense must be from Divine goodness and truth. Given this insight into perception as “nothing less than the Divine coming of influx into the intellectual faculty,” all derivative reflection is understood. But the highest perception also includes the law “written in the heart,” and so the human spirit is understood anew as inherently capable of participating in celestial and spiritual perception. It is no less plain that knowledge is in some sense prior to such perception since the knowledge of a thing must precede in order that there may be perception of it. But even this statement is incomplete, for we have found both love and goodness essential as sources. Love in this interior sense is implicitly both the “affection of truth,” the “perception of truth,” and also the productive life of thought.

All this explicitness is needed for the unmistakable classifications which are to follow: when we first understand that perception as celestial and spiritual is an immediacy above thought as usually described, and above conscience. We have seen that perception in one of its guises is from Divine goodness. Hence, it includes conscience, which is its basis, in fact, just as it includes the internal dictate which pertains specifically to truth. But although conscience might be described as perceptive or intuitive, it falls short of actual revelation or vision of Divine goodness and truth; rather, it is to be known by the fact of its formation from revealed truths (i.e., those of the written Word). It is acquired through faith joined to charity. The highest perception shows what is true and that it is true. Conscience starts with spiritual knowledge as true and is
concerned with realizing it in actual life through love for it, and by the exercise of charity toward the neighbor.

Perception brings a certain happiness and delight due to its pristine purity, its nearness to Divine reality, and to heaven as actual presence. But on the plane of conscience, man comes into the sphere of inner conflict and temptation. Perception as “dictate” is more immediate, especially when it flows in as directly as possible through the angels from the Lord. Thus, it attains higher degrees than conscience. One who is interiorly open to spiritual and celestial reality knows at once by internal observation whether a principle is good and true, whereas one who is spiritually open (but is devoid of this internal observation) has perception in lesser measure. Hence, the spiritual man needs conscience, for example, from truths acquired from parents and the Word. A man may also have conscience from theological doctrine in any religion. The mere existence of conscience is not then the test of insight into Divine truth. But celestial perception is a criterion.

We observe that light is thrown by this teaching on the ancient problem from whence come our ideas? The central question for many has been this: Have we any knowledge by means of a higher faculty, on a higher plane of experience than the channels of sense-perception imply? The answer here given is that even in sense-perception our knowledge of nature is a cooperative product, due more to capacities and influx from within the mind than to subject-matter delivered from without through the senses. In the second place, we have ethical knowledge through conscience produced in us from above, not from below. Conscience is not from custom or convention, as some have maintained. It is not due to racial evolution, as students of ethics have sought to show since the days of Darwin. Therefore, conscience has more than “moral” authority; its sanctions are spiritual, hence Divine.
Hither still, we have spiritual truth or wisdom in the understanding, derived from the source of all truth, Wisdom itself. All spiritual truth being from this one source, by perception rather than inference, it has the authority of this superior degree. As capable of approaching the plane where such perception is the habitual knowledge-activity, we have power to lift the understanding into spiritual light; hence, the power to grow into spiritual insight. Our minds have no power to generate truth as such, not even on the perceptive level. But we have the capacity to receive and this capacity is spiritual, interior in origin, and involves a higher type of response and quest. In the highest sense of all, our spirits have power to receive Divine revelation, a power which has been exercised in man’s spiritual history on earth. Divine truth does not indeed come to the human spirit directly, unless the appropriate spiritual and celestial degrees are open. But such truth is mediated to all men in the recorded doctrines of the Word. Perception from these Divine teachings is within the range of us all, in so far as we acknowledge the interior truths of the Bible as Divine and seek to grow in the enlightenment which comes from this acknowledgment.

Very much depends in this whole psychology on the validity of spiritual perception in its higher reaches. For all the processes and principles here described, including those of sense-perception, are described and explained from the viewpoint of such insight. It is this interior vision, encompassing all the levels and degrees of perception, which discloses the whole point of view from which the psychology is developed. This especially signifies insight from above, from without-outward, with regard to the essentials of elements which make possible all types of knowledge. For this insight yields both knowledge of the interior realities implied in spiritual and celestial degrees, and perception of two-world experience as the experience which relates the spiritual with the natural. We shall postpone the study of some of its deliverances until the
second part of our inquiry, with special reference to revelation, spiritual vision, and the dictate by which our seer was guided in his scriptural interpretations. Here we give heed to such perception or insight as essential to true interpretation of the sense-organs and their deliverances, the inferior types of knowledge, and the relation between reason and Divine truth.

Granted superior perception as the clue to all forms of knowledge, we have a criterion by which to attribute the illuminating element in knowledge to its proper source. This process of recognition is known as apperception, or the discernment of the real meaning within the terms and modes of representation of spiritual truth. Perception yields the information and enables us to describe and explain our facts; for example, when we distinguish between objects near at hand and remote objects on the distant horizon, so that we know what things are near and what things are far in their actual setting. We then group these perceptual findings in such relationships that we have knowledge of the field of sense-perception. So, too, we group or classify our data with reference to the organization of knowledge. We pass from apprehension to comprehension. Apperception is this process by which we interpret our perceptions. The process is not, however, intelligible without constant reference to the influx which is its basis and efficiency. Thus conscience—Divine in origin, implying Divine truths which give us the criterion concerning moral considerations—enables us to understand the duties and consequent details of the moral life, so that we rightly apperceive them. In other words, heavenly influx into the experiences of daily life produces illustrations of the truth needed to clarify our moral experiences. The apperception of goodness, the apperception of truth is the general sense of its reality and value. Thus, conscience itself is an interior apperception, even though conscience is not as high in rank as celestial perception. For there can be apperception from perception on each plane. The highest apperception is celestial.
To hear the dictate of conscience is to obey it, if we are faithful to the apperception which makes it clear to us as expressive of the Commandments. When we are aware of and respond to conscience, the mind is free from the limiting conditions and illusions which so often make right conduct difficult for us. When I recognize and admit that conscience is higher than the promptings of mere sense-experience, sense-inclination and worldly ambition, I possess a clear principle of guidance. Apperception in this sense is an internal “hearing.”56 Granted this dictate, distinguished from the appeal of sensuous things, and abstracted from mere inferences based on custom and conventionality, I have interior thought from affection for spiritual truth, as a genuine guide. Hearing becomes equivalent to obedience with me, when my perception is just that I see the real force and nature of human experience; when I love what is good, right and true, and will to live by it. This love will then steadily intensify my spiritual knowledge. I shall not merely see or perceive, but also interpret my experience, and assign a higher value to what I see, a value so high indeed that I will to make it my own, both thinking and living by it.

Rationality and freedom underlie this moral and spiritual apperception. Rationality is the capacity to understand what is true and, by contrast, what is false. Freedom is the capacity to think, will, and do the things freely which our enlightened understanding thus discloses.57 This rationality comes into activity when the natural mind reaches maturity. Man is then able to confirm by appeal to fact and principle the truths which have come by spiritual perception. General mental and bodily soundness is, of course, a condition of this fine sanity. Rationality as fundamental to genuine understanding is not due to man’s own mentality alone and cannot even be appropriated to man as his own. It is due to God in man; it is a gift which nothing can take away and is essential to man’s generation.58
Chapter 6

Brain and Senses

Granted the principles implied in spiritual perception, the usual topics in psychology may be given their appropriate places in the scale from highest to lowest. It is necessary to begin with spiritual perception in order to see by contrast how meager is the process known as sense-perception which conventional psychology (lacking insight) regards as the basis of investigation. With the conclusion that no perception through the bodily senses is possible without an interior activity which is essentially spiritual, all sense-processes lose their importance; the external point of view ceases to be the starting-point, and the brain loses its central place in psychology. For the brain is an instrument of the spirit, not its cause or basis. The brain may still be said to condition mental life, but this is a condition essential to the life of the spirit in the natural world. The brain is also significant from the point of view of correspondence, in the light of spiritual influx, as we shall presently see.

The brain is not an independent entity or substance, imposing conditions upon mental processes as if these were effects only. The principle of activity implied in these processes and states is from the side of the spirit. Every brain-event or condition is subservient. The brain appears indeed to act of itself and to impose conditions on the mind. But it conditions because it acts obediently. It limits the mind because it is used as a means of grasping the natural world and holding fast its deliverances. Bearing this relationship in mind, we are able to note any fact
concerning its structure and functions, without losing sight of the truth that any eternal viewpoint is an appearance when compared with spiritual perception.

In general, the brain is the “organic principle” or instrument of the interior senses.\textsuperscript{59} It is the “seat of sensation,” also the seat of the mind at large, specifically the seat of volition.\textsuperscript{60} But the term “seat” is always to be understood as the external basis essential to internal processes, never in the sense of mental states produced as if the brain were a generating principle. Understood in the right connection, it follows that the brain not only holds the principle of man’s life,\textsuperscript{61} but is the basis of his will and understanding.\textsuperscript{62} Indeed, the brain is so organized that man’s ideas are “fixed” in it, so that his ideas are permanent as accepted and confirmed.\textsuperscript{63} But this statement is intelligible only in the light of the prior principle that the mind is a spiritual organism terminating in the brain as a natural organism, the natural being seen in the light of the spiritual. Unless the mind in its turn were also an organism and, as such, capable of functioning through the brain, it would be a sort of filmy thing in which man’s ideas would be mere radiations or variations of light flowing into the head.

Later chapters will bring before us a principle which will clarify all these matters. This is the law of \textit{correspondence} as the principle of universal relationships between things that are connected without blending with or merging into one another. By this principle what is within or interior can be presented in what is outside or exterior so that substances can be associated without losing their quality, and causes can be affiliated with effects and yet not cease to hold their appropriate places in the scale of things from the highest to the lowest. Postponing the elucidation of this principle, we merely note the fact at this point in our study that it is presupposed in each topic which is to come before. Granted this principle, we may pass in thought from the spiritual organism to the natural one without surrendering to a materialistic
viewpoint, as if to establish that ideas in the brain simply meant the imprisonment of man in his head as more important than his spirit. As truths are arranged in series and orders and as it were compacted into bundles, so the mind is organized. The brain, as the natural organ or instrument, is coordinated to correspond to these series and orders. The serial arrangement continues throughout.

In the inmost principles of the brain, there are subtle organic parts called the cortical substances, from which and through which the operations of the soul proceed. The left portion corresponds to rational principles, the right to the affections and volitions. The brain is formed and adapted to heavenly influx, its interiors corresponding to the interior forms of heaven, with the descent into interiors of man’s spirit and the ascent there from. Hence it corresponds to the sphere of ends or purposes in general. Its innumerable forms and substances are such that every interior sense can reside in it, with receptacles and dwellings for thoughts and affections, so as to receive and retain the particulars of thought and will. Will and understanding are also in the brain as a whole as well as in part, so that their activities can proceed into the body, the cerebrum being the dwelling-place of the understanding.

The brain consists of two substances, one of which is glandular, and is called the cortical and cineritious substance, and the other fribilous, and is called the medullary substance. The first . . . is arranged into clusters like grapes on a vine. These clustered formations are its series. The second, or medullary substance, consists of perpetual bundling of little fibers issuing from the glandules of the former substance. These bundles are its series. All the nerves that proceed from the brain and pass down into the body for the performance of various functions, are nothing but groups and bundles of fibers; in like manner all the
muscles, and in general all the viscera and organs of the body. All these are such because they correspond to the series in which the mental organism is arranged.\textsuperscript{69}

It thus becomes clear how first principles are in the brain and how these become derivative.\textsuperscript{70} Anatomy supplies the basic facts by teaching that there are two brains, that these are continued from the head into the spinal column, and that they consist of two substances as already indicated. As the little glands are heads of fibrils, so they are their first principles. To the extent that these fibers begin and go forth, they gradually bundle themselves into nerves. When formed, these bundles or nerves descend to the organs of sense in the face, and to the organs of motion in the body in general and form them. The cortical or glandular substance constitutes the surface of the cerebrum, also the surface of the \textit{corpora striata}, from which the \textit{medulla oblongata} proceeds. It also constitutes the middle of the cerebellum, and the middle of the spinal marrow. The chief point to note is that in the medullary or fibrillary substance, everywhere beginning and proceeding from the cortical, the “first principles of life” are to be found; the first principles being the same place as the beginning of the fibers. The beginnings, appearing as little glands, are almost countless, so that to trace them all and to see their connections would be to realize anew that man is like a little cosmos.

The evidence of this physiological basis of mental life are these: (1) man knows by direct perception, by exerting his mind and thinking that he thinks in the brain.\textsuperscript{71} Here the appeal is like that made by the latest type of behaviorism in psychology in our day. That is, “man draws in, as it were, the sight of the eye, contracts the forehead, and perceives the mental process to be within, especially inside the forehead and above it.” (2) The body is so formed in the womb that the brain or head first develops and continues for some time larger than the body. (3) The head is above the body, hence in accordance with the principle that the higher acts upon the lower. (4)
Whenever the brain is injured, either in the womb or as a result of a wound or disease, or by some form of excess, thought is weakened, and possibly the mind is deranged. (5) All the external senses, together with the powers of speech, are localized in the front part of the head (the face), from which there is immediate communication through the fibers with the brains, the sensitive and active life of the senses being thus derived. (6) Hence, it is that love and thought can be imaged in the face. (7) All the fibers descend from the brains through the neck into the body, and no fiber ascends from the body to the brains. Life must be where the fibers in their first principles are. Life originates where the fibers originate. (8) If anyone holds to the contrary, for example, that the soul has its seat in some gland or in the heart, let him try to explain where affection and thought from it has its first principle or basis.

Even the breathing of the spirit depends on fibers from the brains. The brain is the “origin of all things of man’s life.” This is why the head rules everything under it. It also explains why the brain is the form of the mind. We understand why, as the mind inhabits the brains, any idea that becomes fixed is confirmed because of its recipient brain-state. Thought and will being dependent on the organism of the brain, the Divine life flows into it, and thus perception comes about. It is proper to speak of will and understanding as “organic forms,” organized out of the purest substances.

Thought could not inhere in the mind without these organic forms localized in the brain. Granted these, thought can come forth from the brain which is complete and organized for this purpose. Indeed, the description becomes very explicit when it is said that the cerebellum is the special organ of the will, the Divine influx entering the will by means of the occiput. “The organic things of thought are in the brain, and thence flow invisible fibers, through which the
thoughts are led, from the senses into the organic things, and from the organic things into
muscular acts.”

At first thought this reads like materialism. Were these statements to be taken as literal
and final, this would not be a spiritual psychology. We have only to consider the descriptions of
the human soul or spirit to realize that we are here concerned with one aspect only of mental life.
Man’s spirit regarded in the concrete is his mind which is to live after death. Everyone’s mind is
his internal man. This is the man. The internal “resides” in the external while here. But when the
external is put off, the internal survives in a complete human form. Hence, they error indeed who
believe that “man’s mind resides only in the head.” It is there in “first principles” only, so that
what a man thinks from his understanding or does from his will can proceed forth into deeds in
the natural world. In the body, the mind is “in derivatives” formed for sensation and action. The
mind must be in the brain in a very definite way in order to become concretely manifested.
Because the mind “adheres to the bodily structures,” it is able to “impart to them sensation and
motion.” It is a fallacy that the body thinks and acts of itself.
Chapter 7

Sensation

Sensation is describable by reference to sources of information in the world around and by appeal to the capacity for sense-perception as germane to our nature. Mind, with its forms, series, and various powers, notably the understanding as the perceiving faculty, makes sensation possible. The mere possession of sense-organs would not be enough to explain sensation. From the appearances indeed, we might conclude that the external senses, for example, the organs of sight and hearing, deliver their information readymade to the understanding. Objects would then seem to move to the senses, first those that are external, then those that are internal. This would be a wholly fallacious appearance. Sensation is primarily of the spirit, not of the body. It is not a mere product of sense-experience. Its life is spiritual. Its external organs are in the body as an instrument of the spirit. The body is the receptacle in which sense-experiences are gathered. But the efficiency is always due to the life which uses the receptacles, assimilating and organizing sense-impressions.

What is gross and material could not flow into and move what is internal, pure, and spiritual. This would be contrary to Divine order. The truth is that the internal sense pulsates through the external, disposing the “external sensory” to receive objects according to its dictates. Consequently these external sensories, for instance, those of sight, instantly accommodate themselves to all objects according to their nature. This adjustment could not occur unless there was an influx from within the sensories. The fibers and appendages, very numerous in every
sense-organ, are “instantly determined” in keeping with the quality of the object. The life or efficiency flows through the intellectual elements into the rational principle and, from thence, into the memory, with its knowledges, and thus into the sense-processes. The notion that the influx comes from the external world into the internal region where sense perception occurs and there produces sensation—as if its efficiency and cause were from spatial things—is a sheer fallacy. That would involve the assumption that the external feels through the internal when the internal feels through the external; it is the mind that feels, not the body.

The senses are to be understood, therefore, as placed in the body for a purpose, as organs serving the internal man, that he may have experience and knowledge of things and events in the world around him. The sense-organs have not been “acquired” by self-operating evolution, as if there was no Divine purpose or activity in nature.

The apparent feeling focalized in external phases of sense-experience is due to the activity of the internal mentality which functions in sense-perception. The internal and external correspond, according to the general principle later to be considered in all its essentials. But the basis of this relationship is in the internal— in the mind, not in the body. It is implied in the vitality functioning through such perceptions. Granted knowledge of this functioning, we are prepared to study the several sense-organs with their special deliverances. We will not then mistake organ for function. We will not confuse the internal aspect of sensation with the external aspect. As actually apprehended, all sensations tend to be focalized in the brain and to “present” themselves therein. Yet this apparent fact needs correction in view of the truth that sensation is localized in the mind, a process which is made possible by internal activities essentially due to will and understanding.
The grosser sensations are explained by the fact that the body is adapted to purposes in this natural world. This adaptation is localized where the end in question is attained, as in the digestive apparatus, from which sense-processes arise to attract our attention in case of any disturbance. Naturally the more corporeal processes have a grosser sensibility. But bodily processes are also identified with the heart and lungs as the two “founts” of sensation. Since bodily sensations relate to states and fibers of the body, life apparently consists in sense experience. In general, as the sense-processes so the life, and without sense-experience there is no life. Yet sensation is always a second effect of life, not the first. Love is not the life of man in a merely bodily way: it is the spirit which sensates. The relationship is direct between the correspondence of external senses to internal, also between the internal senses and the realities of heaven of which these are images. Correspondence here as elsewhere means agreement, not identity. A sensation of red, green, or blue, as a perceived process retains its quality. As a perceived process, it is very different from the object to which the external aspect of the process is attributed. So too, the higher factors of correspondence retain their several places in the scale of supremacy of internal over external things.

An interior sense is always the basis for the sense-process. Each sense is excited and produced from an influx. The sensation, as such, becomes a fact when stimuli from without supply the requisite subject-matter. The same is true of all internal organs of life. As the love which manifests will would be blind without the light of the understanding, so this same light is essential to each case to the activity of the sense-organs. Every love has its own sense.

Sense in general, or general sense, is distinguished into voluntary and involuntary.

Voluntary sense is proper to the cerebrum, but involuntary is proper to the cerebellum...
These two kinds of general sense are conjoined and yet distinct . . . . These parts which encompass the body, as the muscles and the skin, and also the organs of the senses, for the most part receive fibers from the cerebrum, and hence man has sense and motion in accordance with his will. But the parts within this compass or enclosure which are called the viscera of the body receive fibers from the cerebellum; and consequently man has no sense of these parts, nor are they under the control of the will. Influx from the cerebellum insinuates itself especially into the face, and the affections appear in the face, and this for the most part without man’s will—such as fear, reverence, shame, various kinds of gladness, and also of sadness.

The external senses are five in number. Touch corresponds to perception in general and is fundamental to sensations in the spiritual world where it is more exquisite than here. Touch is in direct relation to the will; the sensuous delight which we feel in bodily experiences is closely connected with this sense-perception. The medium of touch is the skin enveloping the body, the substance and form of the skin being such that the skin itself seems to feel. The sense of touch is not, of course, in the object brought into tactual relation with the skin, but in the structure of the skin, touch sensation being a process affected by means of objects brought into contact with the skin.

Taste also is produced by affecting the substances and form of the tongue, the tongue being more important than the object tasted. Hearing seems to take place where the sound originates, as when one hears the ringing of a bell in an adjoining corridor. The auditory sensation is, however, localized in the ear. The apparent projection of the sensation to a distance is natural enough, since we readily tend to objectify our sensations. The ear is itself unable to
know, unable to perceive, for example when someone is speaking. The meaning of the audible sounds is perceived and known within the mind, through the interior perception. The mind (mens) incites the ear to hear, directs the eye to see, moves the tongue and lips to speak, impels the fingers and hands to do whatever it pleases, and the feet to walk whenever it wills. Thus, too, it is the understanding which smells, by the aid of sense-perception. To smell is to perceive. The mind’s perception corresponds to the odor apprehended by the organ of smelling.

Without interior sight there would be no exterior sight, for the eye could never see by itself; the visual sensation is made possible by the interior perceptual process. In the perception of objects at a distance, the visual experience seems to be wholly objective, as if the organism reached to yonder mountain or touched the moon. But the visual perceptions by which we intelligibly relate objects in space, attributing the mountain to a certain locality a certain number of miles away, and the moon to a region 240,000 miles away, are highly complex processes interpreted by much experience. We judge distances solely by means of things intervening between the object specified, for example, yonder mountain peak, and the position from which we observe, coupled of course with our knowledge of the solar system in the case of the distant moon. We judge also by the diminution and consequent indistinctness of the object, for instance, a distant house seen through fog. Sight does not go out from the eye to the object seen. Visual perception is due to the image which enters the eye and affects its responsive substances.

Interior sight is of the spirit and, when opened, discloses the realities of the spiritual world. Granted this spiritual perception as already described, man is able to see in external things in the natural world what they signify in their spiritual meaning. The understanding, in general, is internal sight, the real sight which, since it is of the spirit, endures into the other life. Bodily
sight is from the light of the world, while understanding is from the light of heaven. The internal senses in general are formed according to the image of heaven, hence, spiritual correspondences relate more directly to them. It is the soul that sees, discerning from what is interior. Granted this interior activity, the things seen by aid of the bodily eye fall into their proper spheres. The spiritual senses in general pertain especially to life in the spiritual world and, hence, are only partly connected with this life. But although mostly quiescent, they made possible the cruder processes of our ordinary sense-experiences. These ordinary experiences supply us with memory-images, hence, contribute subject-matter for imagination. More interiorly speaking, this imagery forms a basis for thought. Much of our thinking is in terms of visual figures. The significant consideration, however, is the intelligence by which we discern the reality of these things of sense-experience. Already we have a measure of this light which illuminates by means of interior sight, objects which we but dimly see by common perception. We see objects outside of us by means of the forces and conditions of the natural world. To see within oneself is to discern from heavenly light, a sight which has extension in the spiritual world.

The brain, as the chief bodily organ, exists then as the physical instrument of sense-perception through which the various sense-impressions or deliverances of the sense-organs are received. The sense-organs are adapted as receptors to the various types of impressions which are related to objects seen, heard, touched, smelled, and tasted. Without these end-organs we would be unable to receive the requisite information in detail for constituting our knowledge of nature. No sense-process is of primary interest for this psychology. Hence, there is no analysis to determine whether there are more than the classic five types of sensation to which the number was limited until the days of recent psychology. What is of moment is sense-experience as
produced from within. The mind has a bodily organism for the explicit purpose of making contact with the natural world possible. Hence, the whole significance of the body lies in its purpose. To add to the conventional five senses the activities of the dermal sense by which temperature, pressure, and pain are noted; the sense-perceptions involving the kinesthetic sense (with reference to muscles and tendons) and those of the equilibration sense (through the semi-circular canals), would not be to change the principles of this psychology in any way. Every sense has its organ, and the organ is stimulated in specific ways, according to the given sense. Thus, warm and cold objects stimulate certain regions of the skin, while changes in position of muscles and tendons are associated with kinesthetic sensations. The principle of relationship or correspondence applies to the whole field of sense-experience, however elaborate and extensive that field may prove to be in the light of recent observations. No sense-stimulation is self-explanatory. No sense functions by itself. The end-organs make their several deliverances which we interpret by sense-perception. That is the main fact.

To avoid any misconception regarding the reality of material objects apprehended by sense-experience, we note especially that external things, as such, are “material, inanimate, and dead.”103 Through bodily sight man sees really existing things around him, and the body acts through material muscles.104 Our perception of objects is, of course, very much more than experience as a psychological process, since the intellectual element of perception is spiritual in principle.105 But physical things consist of tangible material substances; these “things” are not in any sense products of our perception. The mind’s instrument is also material. Indeed, physical objects are so emphatically real that, granted a sensuous impetus on man’s part, “material things carry the lower mind downwards.”106 Thus, material things, being heavy, induce slowness on man’s part, tending to immerse his mind in earthly matters. Naturally enough, man’s earlier ideas
are materialistic in type since he forms them from objects in the “grosser nature” of objects around him—things he has seen and touched in the world and upon the earth which are obviously material. Even when man’s thought is above materiality, his ideas are still terminated in these things.\textsuperscript{107}

To think materialistically, to see and through other senses to perceive physical things, is to think in a relatively gross and obscure way.\textsuperscript{108} But it does not follow from this that to see the qualities of things and to perceive their affections is to discern them as if they were by-products of our experience, fading away with the waning of sense-perceptions referring to them. \textit{The things are there} whether perceived or not. Their qualities adhere in them. So the atmospheres and everything else characteristic of earths and suns are independent of man’s existence, and it is a question of their relations in the astronomical system.\textsuperscript{109} Tangible things are always to be described and explained within their own field. The truth is that the “image” of all created things is spiritual. That things “filled full of the matters of this world” have uses—this is another consideration, not to be confused with the fanciful notion sometimes entertained that objective things exist only as “ideas,” or only for human perception. Since “material things are in themselves fixed, stated and measurable; fixed because they are permanent, however the states of men may be changed,” this is of fundamental moment on the bodily side of human experience.\textsuperscript{110} This physical constancy once thoroughly recognized, we are in a position to consider the relativities of human sense-experience, noting that sensation as a bodily function has also its subjective or inner side. Thus, each man, as a participant in such experiences, lives in his own mental world, subject to falsities, some of which have as little relation to bodily reality as the ghosts we see as children.
Chapter 8

The Body

As the brain with the other sense-organs is the instrument of the mind, so the body is a material organ. It is merely a garment clothing the spirit, serving man during his earthly existence. By means of it, the soul finds expression through man’s conduct in the natural world.

The body neither lives nor thinks, but the spirit, imbuing the bodily organs with life, thinks through the body. In fact, the body comes forth from the spirit, exists through it—its purposes or ends being those of the spirit. Thus, the body, by representing the qualities and activities of the spirit, corresponds to it so that, in the relation of spirit to body, we have an ideal instance of the law of spiritual things in natural. This general relationship is seen in detail when we note that the mind is represented point by point in the body, so that everything in the body corresponds to will and understanding, every particular of thought and will being inscribed on it. In matters of conduct, the body is especially the instrument of will. The external form of man’s conduct portrays responsively whatever the mind thinks and wills. This conformity to will and understanding is such, in brief, that the body is “nothing but obedience.”

This statement may seem strange for the moment. Yet, to observe the behavior of our fellowmen is to find it true. The body as readily shows forth a stormy outburst of emotion such as anger, hatred, or embittering jealousy, as a gentle emotion of grief which finds vent in quietly restrained tears, a pleasant smile, or an indifferent intellectual attitude. It is as well equipped for the clenching of the fists, the flushed face, or the admission of guilt, as for forgiveness,
innocence, or spontaneity. It is prepared for both passion and purity. Hence, it serves both the libertine and the man who possesses exceptional self-control. It adapts itself to the normal and the abnormal in man’s mental life, including the wise and foolish, and loving and hate-breathing inner states. More significantly still, it responds to either health or disease of spirit, either good or evil motives, as we see more clearly when we consider these contrasted states in the light of their spiritual correspondences.

The spirit is not localized in the brain alone, as the chief organ of the body. It is in the body, using its forces and ruling by means of them. As “love is the life of man,” so the body is the expression of the affections constituting this love. Such as the soul is, such the body. What man confirms himself in by his good or evil affections, his beliefs and attitudes, gives color and tone to his whole existence through his body into outward forms of expression, as we note in the man who, given over to sensual indulgences, uses his body to foster that type of affection. Love is not only the general life of the body but is central to it, so that by correspondence all parts relate to heart and lungs. The pulse and breathing of the spirit flow into the pulse and breathing of the body, acting as their efficient cause. So, the soul “transacts” its life in the body by blood, and the body does nothing save as thus actuated.

Thus, the body, as a corporeal principle, is the ground in which natural, rational, and spiritual matters are implanted in their order. Body is the natural or material basis of mind. This does not mean that the body is a basis as a mere receptacle as if totally different in structure and substance, devoid of direct connections. But the relation is never that of reciprocal union as if the body and mind were equals. Through the fact that action is free and full of mind into body, the relation is so intimate between substances and structure that the spirit contributes the inmost principles of the head, also the inmost principles of the body at large. Thus, the mind is actually
“in” the whole body. Further, the spirit actually is the purer substance of the body in the organs of motion and sense-perception. Our thoughts may then proceed from facts relating to mind, to facts pertaining to body without a break, by noting how mind supplements and completes body, the spirit being the vital basis throughout. As mind is far more developed and significant than is apparent from a study of the body, so man is much more highly organized than he seems to be when we take note of his bodily behavior only. Bodily and worldly thoughts would induce obscurity, if we judged by these alone. It is the sensitive power appearing in the body which, properly speaking, pertains to the spirit that is truly significant, not the body. The spirit is of the body only through the influx which imbues and uses it. Although the body seems to sensate by itself, it can neither see, hear, smell, nor feel. The appearance that the body lives of itself, or that it thinks is a falsity. The body is a more exterior degree, the spirit being interior. This is a vitally important fact to remember in using our bodies. To act from the body as such would be to become a slave to it, like the sensuous person who lives only to eat and drink. The more a man acts from it, the less he acts from reason, from his interior selfhood.

The external form, which is of the body, is renewed according to the renewal of the internal form, which is of the mind. But as the outward man grows old, the spiritual passes into newness of life, a fact of profound importance in our preparation for the life after death. Both the pleasure and the memory connected with the body are exterior. These facts become more significant when we learn that the spiritual memory is interior, spiritual pleasure or “delight” being much higher in type than physical pleasure, with its external associations.

It does not then follow that whatever is true of body is true of spirit as some have assumed. The direct clue is always found in the fact that the spirit, rich in value and content, in affections and thoughts, acts in the body in so far as the spiritual can act into the natural. The
body is inwardly so organized as to carry out in minute detail the spirit’s behests. If the body possessed equality of action, so that the body could act in and upon spirit, it could inflict its evil desires on the interior man. The body is always “from the man.” It is never the whole man himself.\textsuperscript{117} Hence, spirit and body never consult and deliberate together, as if to decide which one shall rule. Nor does man ever request the body to act as he wishes. The body has no alternative but to obey. Spirit makes and controls it. The body is inevitably and invariably compliant, responsive through and through.

As a vehicle of good or bad heredity, the body is either a sound or an unsound basis for the development of the spiritual life according to the man and his type of life.\textsuperscript{118} There is need of cleansing it from lusts which urge man on to give consent. Bodily lusts make their appeal not through the emotions, but enter through the externals of man’s thought, seeking the mind’s consent, that they may then become actively manifest through the body. Such lusts are like fire. The freer the course granted them, the further they spread. Bodily enjoyments divert the thoughts and banish reflection. Hence the evils must be put away, and the externals of the body must be open so that a cleansing process may occur. Man has great power over his body through his spirit, because his spirit is in every least activity in process in his organism. Spirit imparts to body every impetus which the body executes. It is always the energizing force or vitalizing efficiency. Thus, it is that every particle of thought and will is inscribed, not merely upon or through the brain, but in the bodily organism as a whole. Hence, a man can determine the state of his body by infusing his thoughts and affections into it.\textsuperscript{119}

This control of spirit over body, such that body is sheer obedience, is not a vague or merely general activity. Whatever is realized through the body is done in or through it from will through thought, not by thought at random.\textsuperscript{120} The interior principles of the mind have no power
save through the action of the body according to law and order. The union of will and understanding constitutes a living “endeavor” (\textit{conatus}) or striving which attains its end. This is accomplished, not by continuity, as students of psychology are apt to assume, as if a wish could immediately flow into the desired result. It takes place by correspondences involving the contiguity or nearness of mind in body without the blending of the one in the other.

The mind’s power is made concrete by this intimate relation with the organic activity of the body. The mind would have no power over the organs and functions dependent on heart and lungs, even if the action of heart and lungs should cease. The action of mind on body is always by influx, and whatever impedes influx, hinders action. In specific details, this action by correspondence means that the interiors of mind act as one with the interiors of the body, the externals of the mind as one with bodily externals.\textsuperscript{121}

The spirit could not exist if merely passive. Hence, it is an active being by nature and structure in every respect. But even then, it could not act in the natural world without a means of becoming determinate or concrete (“ultimate,” a term to be later explained). Therefore it clothes itself with an organism which serves at once as garment and as instrument. Hence, in turn, the body is adapted to receive living forces flowing in through the soul from the Divine. The life thus received is continually flowing from its source in the Lord. Thus, the body is made “as it were” to live, to take on the appearance of independent life. It is these instrumental forces which enable the soul to impel the body with all its appurtenances at will. Mind, building body by influx, moves into it by a concordant activity which takes place at the same time with the bodily processes without ever being identical with them. We observe this in the expression of wisdom and love which man responds to in spirit and apprehends as part of himself; he also makes these spiritual states manifest (in part) by aid of speech, by bodily motions and various forms of
behavior different in their external aspects from the states they represent. By making his interior life concrete in deeds and other forms of expression, man draws to himself “contaminants” or vehicles of spiritual principles by which he continues and perpetuates life from within. These outermost receptacles are the forms in which interior principles find their termination. The principle is that all things in the spiritual world, consequently all in the natural, seek something ulterior in which they shall be contained, as the effect is said to contain the whole. Man is so created that, whatever he receives by Divine influx, can descend through his entire nature to the lowest or most ultimate level, which is at the same time most external. Hence the function of the body is to be understood as a terminal relationship. In the ascending series, from nature and body to mind, man is once more the uniting medium between natural and spiritual things. Since the receptacles of a lower plane make it the “complex and containment” of the plane above it, and so on down through the series to the last, the body as the outermost receptacle has the possibility of complete expression of the powers manifested through it. Thus, the purpose of the given activity is fulfilled.

The complete outward expression of spiritual reality in external or bodily form is not, however, always attained. It is incomplete in man because of his departure from Divine order. The influx from inmost to outmost is often impeded at crucial points. Man frequently fails to realize or live by possibilities of his spiritual nature. Moreover, his body, subject to adverse desires and passions as already indicated, falls far short of manifesting health, purity, and freedom. The Divine truth, proceeding from influx from the Lord, has indeed all power to become completely manifest. The outermost phases of life should conform in entire harmony with the innermost. Then the outer would contain and manifest all power. But there are successive stages of expression to be gained if the process shall attain its perfect completion. To
understand failures at any point is to possess the psychology of obscurities and falsities impeding the way, to be considered in a later chapter.

In the outgoing order, \textit{will} always come first, then thought, and next deed or conduct embodying what was in the will as intention. Man is judged, naturally enough, by thoughts and affections which succeed in finding expression in deeds, even though in his inner life his loves or motives may be richer in content or value. The whole man is in a measure presented in his deeds. Granted complete expression, the impelling power is said to be simultaneously present and functioning in inmost and outmosts. Thus, the outmost is said to “support” the power or life presented there, as well as containing the life which was at first merely interior.\textsuperscript{125} It follows from the foregoing statements that this is sometimes an ideal only. The present description of men and women as actually found in the world would be qualified by the adverse inner states and the break in correspondences due to impeding spheres and influences, also to unfavorable conditions taken on by contact with the hereditary trends into which people are born.

The natural or bodily plan is then the outermost or last term in the series from within-outward. It brings to its termination everything that was involved in processes previously going on that did not meet a setback in the outward drive toward complete expression. Everything in nature is said to be a terminating image by correspondence with spiritual things. Man’s body, as a part of nature, belongs to this universal series. In type or standard, the life of man in passing through the various degrees from inmost to outmost, corresponds to the law of manifestation. Everywhere interior things inflow toward what is outmost as the law of their existence in a scale. The highest instance of complete expression in outermosts—when the Word became flesh and dwelt among us—is typical of the law that every Divine work shall become complete or perfect through the outermost plane in the universe. This is true of small things as of great. The spiritual
principle is always the type. This is the test in tracing the correspondence between every interior activity in man and all modes of expressing such activity in conduct and behavior in the natural world. We have here a basis for interpretation in studying the nature and meaning of events. We have also an ideal for guidance in becoming informed about hindrances to the Divine influx, and the way to put ourselves more and more in line with this influx. Any failure to conform is to be judged by reference to the Divine standard. Man is unable to achieve better adjustment by himself, as if his mind possessed unlimited power over the body. His part is to become aware of the obstructions and to will to be made free from those inner states through which, by affection and thought, he most directly interferes with the influx; meanwhile doing everything he can, by word or deed, in actual bodily behavior, to make his external life a perfect vehicle. The emphasis which falls on the body, as the last term in a series seeking complete expression, is characteristic of this doctrine from first to last. Understanding the place of the body in this series, we are prepared to see the meaning of the ultimate or outermost plane in general in relation to the doctrine of knowledge.
Chapter 9

Memory

The doctrine of memory is peculiarly important in this system. For it is not alone a question of the necessary existence of memory if there shall be either knowledge or experience, but of the relation of memory to assured conditions of survival of bodily death. Most psychologies are woefully incomplete in this respect, because no basis for memory is found other than the existence of brain-habits involving substances that decay when death ensues. The view is no longer tenable that the present existence is “but a sleep and a forgetting,” as if a kind of reminiscence should sometime make us aware that we had lived before. Nor would it be plausible to revert to popular beliefs in spirit-communications on the ground that a disembodied spirit can give evidences of the survival of memory. The only sure basis is found through profound insight into the relatedness of two-world experience.

The preceding chapters imply the existence of memory as germane to sense-experience and essential to memory-knowledge. Man, as a responsive agent adapted to existence here not only receives life but transmits it. In reacting upon what he receives he enters it to make it more or less a part of himself. His will and understanding, indeed, all his receptacles and organs, fit him for this purpose. Life, entering in and flowing out, never leaves its faculties or vessels unchanged. The activity of will and understanding is one of constant changes of state. For unless our faculties were thus in incessant exercise, we could not have experience, and could not know.
We have already seen that man’s activity operates through “changes of state and variations of form.”

Moreover, we retain the impressions produced upon brain and mind not merely by the life which acts upon our organisms, but by our responses from moment to moment, as our states vary and as our mental forms change. We retain these impressions due to experience, both because we could not otherwise respond in the future in improved ways, and because we could not bear in our selfhood those fruits of action which we call character. This power to retain, reorganize, and express anew in the changing states which follow, depends upon memory. This process of remembering is not as simple as it seems, but involves retention and recall, a storehouse of impressions of vast extent, also of ideas, imaginings, emotional experiences, volitions, and the like. On the side of the brain, it implies substances and a structure organized for this complexity. On the mental side, it involves a wealth of activities able to use all these data. To add that there is also an enduring memory is to presuppose yet another treasury where more significant impressions abide in a much more trustworthy substance, which will not fade with the passing of the bodily organism.

We presuppose on the fleshy side, then, the marvelously responsive structure which makes possible the receiving and retaining of sense-impressions amidst varying conditions from infancy to old age. On the part of the soul or spirit we start with the existence of spiritual substances, with capacities neither produced by, nor dependent on, this cerebral structure, with its tissues subject to decay. This means two types of receptacles, physical and spiritual. For memory could not exist in either case without its appropriate recipient forms, responsive in minutest detail to every impression produced on them.
Memory, fundamentally speaking, is due to the existence and continued functioning of these receptacles with their changing states. Hence, memory is known by relationships attributable to these states in processes of constant mutation. An expression, once impressed on the recipient plate, may be recovered in a subsequent mental process, which may alter the original impression, as we all know when memory plays what we call its “tricks” upon us. This recovery of past impressions involves not merely what man has experienced in contact with objects in nature, but what he has thought, willed, said, and done, amidst varied activities which have been going on within him while he was experiencing the relationships of things outside. This experience or its equivalent remains with him and is a fund to be drawn upon as life proceeds through successive stages from infancy onwards, stages in which interests vary as much as memory. In this general sense memory pertains to man’s whole life here, and is intimately essential to, and in keeping with, the Divine purpose.

More specifically, memory has meaning with reference to the several stages of knowledge, from the reproduction of mere sense-experience to the receiving and retaining of Divine truth, and from the first impressions relating to the formation of character as not only acquired in the natural world but persisting into the spiritual. Of special significance in this connection is that phase of memory which functions through the storing away of truths which persist in the mind as “remains.” But this interior process cannot be made clear until we consider what memory is as characteristically exterior.

As exterior, memory is an organic form proper to the body. It is dependent on the tissues and structure of the brain, in which all sense-impressions are registered. This memory corresponds to, or represents, everything in man’s experience in the natural world. It is the storehouse of all impressions received through the external senses, the natural basis of
experience of external objects and events in the world of space and time. Again, it is instrumental to all language. For language is not only essential through the naming of objects, but by aid of our ideas of the relationships of these objects—their conditions, sources, laws, sequences—and all terminology wherewith we transact our affairs with one another. Here, as pertaining to the subject-matter of daily speech, enters in the type known as “memory-knowledge,” a type which chiefly depends on the reproduction of sense-imagery. By aid of this imagery events are recollected in the order and in the manner experienced. Such knowledge is contrasted with higher types, because to the degree that perception enters the process, we recast even sense-impressions, and depart from what we originally experienced to what we believe we experienced or think we ought to have experienced.

Exterior memory is immediate to the organs and functions of the body in its contacts with things in the world. It was originally formed from the objects of the senses, especially those of sight and hearing, through memory-images capable of being readily reproduced. The objects and events of the world about us enter in as it were through eye and ear, and the other sense-organs. The sense-impressions are then registered, and the sense-forms contribute subject-matter through the reconstituting of which not only reproductive imagination arises, but also productive imagination. Thus, is involved the sphere of fancy, fantasy, and sometimes fallacy or radical misinterpretation—when our thought departs more widely from things presented. The variations are registered in the substances which are the beginnings of the fibers. Hence, these substances in the brain constitute the physiological basis of memory.

The forms, as thus registered, vary with the changes of state of the affections and the persuasions resulting from them. Thus, memory as a process explained within the human organism, is not said to be due to a mechanical operation, as if the vibrations of energy entering
in through the sense-organs and producing impressions on the responsive substance of the brain combined in an automatic fashion to generate perceptions and thoughts. If that were the case, the law of the automatic association of ideas would be regarded as the basis of the intellectual life. The primary fact is that the exterior memory is a receptacle from which may be taken the subject-matter which is serviceable in the life which man wills to pursue. There is no inherent life in the memory as such.

It is not sense-experiences combining themselves in the memory which make a man a materialist. A man is a materialist because, permitting himself to put sensuous things first, he seeks those experiences which foster this type of affection. We all have mental storehouses in which are cherished our contacts or impressions due to the world of things around us. But there is no life in the exterior memory as such to affect our interiors. The interior is affected, and man becomes a materialist when he subordinates the activities of his inner life to sensuous things; whereas he was made for a higher mode of life.

It is possible for us to think from memory only, from memory-images due to things seen, heard, touched, in the outer world. In this sense of the word, we think outside of ourselves as it were, merely reproducing with slight variations what we have observed without giving much heed to it. Thus, we may “speak from the natural man,” with his memory. We may live a purely natural life, letting one event come after another as one picture succeeds another on the screen, as if we were sheer participants in the play. But this would be very different from using sense-imagery which we have stored away within us to “think with the spirit” for spiritual ends.

As we might expect, there is in this psychology no teaching regarding association, its processes and laws, as the chief principle by which the exterior memory is to be explained. Accordingly, there is no assumption that sense-impressions spontaneously combine to produce
percepts, and these to produce concepts or ideas. This means that no stress is put on vividness, recency, similarity, nearness (contiguity), or other characteristics of experiences and ideas usually dwelt on by psychologists who account for memory by association. In fact, the relationship of ideas in knowledge is not explained by appeal to any mechanical principle; instead, the efficiency is always attributed to will and understanding as receptacles of influx.

The explanation of the origin and development of our ideas often given is that, as objects and events are experienced together in the field of life in general, those things which are experienced together are laid down in memory together, and therefore are subject to recall in the sequences in which they occurred. To recollect that we met John Brown in London is to call up scenes in the visual field in question, and events that happened one after another in an order or series with which the will had nothing to do. It is the force or vividness of a recently experienced event, for example, which leads to its recall, while other experiences fade either because they are faint, indistinct, remote, or for some other reason obscure. Or, it may be the resemblance or similarity of the details. One item reminds us of another almost without limit on this basis. But the prime fact is that experiences occur in a context, and that the sequence is retained. Obviously, association runs all through every such sequences. It is a central law of the human mind. Without it there could be no memory, order, system, or what we call intelligence. Yet, if mind works by association, whether we will or not, many processes being due to the bare fact that things associated together when experienced are recalled in this relation, the mere principle of association explains nothing in a fundamental way. Brain-habit might be true as a fact regarding the exterior memory, but the explanation offered would not necessarily be mechanical. Association might well penetrate all mental activity as its central process descriptively speaking. Yet, it would still be a question of the directive power which regulates this activity. Commonly,
such direction is attributable to interest or attention. But substitute *affections* arising from will and understanding, and you have cleared the way for an interpretation of association in behalf of the influent spiritual life which goes forth to achieve its ends. Behind “interest” is love of truth, and, behind this, is an impetus instilled into the soul by Divine influences. Granted a reigning love, you have associates without number formed in the mind through pursuit of truth. These associates are effects not causes. So, too, attention depends on activities amidst which it appears in connection with reigning affections.

Again, the relationships in which the body is habitually found indicate sources of association. Here is a drunkard or gambler, led on from stage to stage of experience among his cronies, for whom he has affinities through yielding to that type of affection which infills him from day to day. Given his presence in evil surroundings, his mind will be storing away associates accordingly. If the heart of an evil-doer is touch, so that another type of love displaces the evil type, allied affections will enter, and there will be a different quest for satisfaction. Consequently, another group of associations will be formed in the mind, with other habits in the body. We advise a person who has been disappointed in love to take up a line of work involving service for others, well knowing that with a love which “takes him out of self,” radical changes will follow. To put the emphasis on changing affections is not, then, in any sense to minimize the results which entail new associations. The mere process of connectedness of ideas or experiences is always secondary to the affectional meaning, notably when this meaning implies Divine truths early laid down in the memory and functioning in a later period of a man’s history in response to what we frequently call a “change of heart.”

If there were but one memory, wholly dependent on the tissues of the brain, all associations would be broken at death. But granted the interior memory, we may lift from the
external plane to the internal nearly everything that was said descriptively about the exterior memory, and thus make our picture of the interior process very graphic. The great qualification is that the interior memory, although in most respects a counterpart of the exterior, is not permanently dependent on the brain, and will neither cease to function nor to exist when physical death occurs.

Understanding in what sense inner experience is superior to outer, we are prepared then for the statement that the interior memory contains impressions of everything a man has ever heard, seen, or has otherwise been affected through the instrumentality of his senses. For nothing ever perishes, not even the mere items of the minutest particulars. There are indeed obliterations in the exterior memory. For, externally speaking, many experiences are superficial, or very transitory. But the interior memory is man’s Book of Life. Here belong in greatest clarity the matters he has entered, his experiences in the affairs he has taken unto himself decisively. The interior memory belongs essentially to the spirit. As proper to the spirit it pertains to interior matters, is adapted to and corresponds to them, to the rational, the spiritual, and the celestial.

This memory is scarcely known by man, because it acts in accord with the exterior memory, drawing memory-images therefrom and otherwise utilizing sense-experiences. The “ideas of thought” flow into these details, and thus, thought in general goes on when we picture things in our description of the world of nature around us. The process of using our memory-images is, in fact, inseparable from us. Unwittingly, we undertake many things which we do not will, confirming our ways of thinking by sense-material. Hence much of our thinking is mere appropriation of the contents of the exterior memory, which we draw upon without knowing there is a difference between what we interiorly love, and hence will, and what we exteriorly utilize without really making it our own.
The interior memory is of course organic, and it retains impressions far more profoundly than does the exterior memory. As organic it is purer, more perfect, that is, formed not alone from experiences relating to outer things; but, so far as the inner life is opened, it is formed from the objects of interior sight, disposed into a regular series. Its organic basis is a medullary substance. It registers our affections and deeds so that the end to which our activities lead here in our conduct in the natural world is visible to the spiritual world, with the sphere which such affections imply.

It follows that the interior memory is entirely distinct, independent of the exterior. This memory is common to men living in the flesh and men living in the spiritual world after death. It therefore pertains not merely to thought in the present life-round, but to the ideas which constitute the speech of angels and spirits. It contains, in general, the rational principles essential to real thought, the principle of the universal spiritual language as opposed to mere “ideas of thought” in the languages which we speak on earth. Man comes into this spiritual language after death. He has the principles essential to it now, inherent in his spiritual nature. Since his future conduct is to depend to a large extent on the life he has lived here, there must be a way whereby character is retained in minutely faithful degree. This function is fulfilled by the interior memory. Naturally, then, “myriads of ideas” flow from spiritual sources into a single idea of the memory-knowledge type of the exterior memory. To think about a man from the point of view of his civic function, let us say as a ticket-seller in a theatre, would not be to follow out his life as a man very far. But if his whole career were disclosed before us in the light of his interior motives and their resulting deeds, a great influx of ideas would enter in by way of explanation and interpretation of his present spiritual state.
The direct clue to these experiences from which form permanent impressions is that indicated above: what is retained from the memory-knowledges in the past is what is introduced by means of an affection.\(^{132}\) The reason is found in the fact that in affection there is life, hence enough power to produce such an impression. It is the element of goodness in the affection which contributes the efficiency. This fact shows why vividness or persistence of memory is not due to mechanical association. When I am fortunate enough, for instance, to be actuated by love of the neighbor, so that I enter deeply into a kind act, it is goodness that prompts me. The good is the power that forces home the deed which remains with me as part of my inner life. Consequently, the continued presence of the results of this deed is not to be explained on the mere assumption that I was “interested” or “absorbed,” with my “attention” directed in a certain way. All these are minor matters.

If I shall be judged righteously in the hereafter by what I am at heart, by what my real deeds signified, I must already be registering at heart the reality of my deeds. After death the reality will be seen without the accessories. For these are as necessary in themselves as the color of my clothes or the shape of my hat, here in the world of changing fashions and mere conventionality. Things which are of no moment fall into the background. Those which enter with affection come into the light. Matters that are in the light are later seen clearly and vividly whenever they are called up out of memory. Thus, one again realizes how influential is the “affection of love.”\(^{133}\) One sees anew why the implantation of truth depends upon its union with the good as the means of conjunction. The greater the affection, the stronger the conjunction. The more marked this ardor of affection, the more enduring the significant interior memory. For although the interior memory records the minutest details of our deeds, there must of course be a central impetus to awaken the details. When an experience which has stirred me deeply is
recalled, I am brought into the presence of a thousand and one details indirectly through the awakening of that experience anew.

Memory being then inclusive of the changes of state in the purely organic substances of the mind, we presuppose an initial process which may be compared to the mere ruminating of food in the stomach of an animal. Then comes a process of assimilation. Truths constitute the food of the mind. Man ruminates over these. He is able so to dwell on them as to establish them. The sense in which this rumination may be called subconscious will depend upon the conclusions we reach in another chapter. But it is already clear that what is of vital moment for character and the spiritual life is assured on the principle that, while both types of memory are organic, the impressions of the interior memory are not made on the perishable substances of the brain alone, but on the enduring spiritual substances of which the interior mind consists. The recording impression-plate, physiologically speaking, is not then the significant basis of the registrations of memory.

This being so, what we call “loss of memory” in the case of people who wander away, forgetting even their own names, unable to recognize dear friends, is temporary. The same is true of lapses of memory in old age. Whatever damage may be done to the brain, for instance, through shell-shock or the use of narcotics, the real man survives, though partially buried in vagueness; and the real man is there for all moral and spiritual purposes. For while the bodily organism may be seriously impaired, as in insanity, with actual destruction of cells and tissues, there is an interior substance which does not suffer impairment with the lowered condition of the brain. The fact that memory has a physiological basis, so long as we are in the body, does not mean that memory is wholly conditioned or limited by the brain. Hence our explanation of memory is in spiritual terms.
The same principle is to be applied in answering the questions which our hearts prompt us to ask regarding possible recognition of our loved ones in the spiritual world. Already, in this world, we are spiritually related to those who are akin; this kinship is taken as the basis of extended descriptions of life in the hereafter, in *Heaven and Hell*. In so far as we already belong together through such kinship, the basis of union is spiritual; it is not conditioned by the body and is not limited by memory localized in the brain. It is the life or love conditioning the interior memory which is of vital moment. In so far as we already know our friends through what they are at heart, we possess true means of identification, far removed from those transitory signs which are often as superficial as recognition based on the hat or the suit a man wore the last time, we saw him. Men undergo great external changes so that, in the final analysis, the only conclusive means of identification is their finger-prints. But just as the finger-prints are so definite that even the most cunning criminal could scarcely deceive an expert, so the interior memory records any number of matters that are individual and are sure to endure. All these belong to the real man.

In some psychologies, memory is the most important principle because all knowledge is explained by reference to the sense-impressions and other traces, combined with the ideas associated with them, which are reproduced out of memory. In the present doctrine, memory, although regarded as essential to all knowledge, does not contribute the efficiency which develops the facts of experience into knowledge. Hence the exterior memory is relegated to a minor place, together with all knowledge dependent on it. But the interior memory is of very great moment, as essential to relationship between our present life and the life after death. It is obvious that the true interpretation of all psychical experience will turn upon our ability to use this knowledge of the interior memory.
Chapter 10
Remains

There are various phases of memory which have always remained unaccounted for on the assumption that memory is due to brain-impressions and automatic association. Amidst the waning of memory in old age, there is in many people a significant recurrence of ideas and interests pertaining to early life. This return to significant youthful impressions is not explained by the mere decay of tissues which recorded impressions of the later years of a person’s experience. These recurring impressions are apt to relate to early religious training, the habit of prayer, belief in God, and faith in the existence of the soul. The impressions of youth, which have been covered up for more than half a life-time, may rise into power once more. Thus, a person who has been a disbeliever for half a century may find his faith still inwardly strong. Apparently, his doubting years were superficial, while the years of his faith were deep and permanent. It is no explanation to say that faith recurs because of the weakness of old age.

The conviction has long prevailed that the impressions of childhood are so consequential that, given an opportunity to rear and teach a child during his first seven years, it will, morally and spiritually speaking, be a question of those years, and not of the years of worldly contacts during youth and manhood. Again, it is well known that an impressive experience, or even a familiar word or hymn may call up endeared associations of childhood, long forgotten; and to be thus recalled to childhood, may be to begin on a higher level of effort and conduct. Experiences narrated by persons who have narrowly escaped drowning, and who have retrospectively witnessed the drama of their whole life, with an untold number of forgotten incidents, have led to
the popular conviction that nothing we have lived through is lost. A forgotten memory may indeed be covered up so that it cannot be recovered by any effort. Yet new experiences may accomplish what effort could never attain.

The distinction between interior and exterior memory at once suggests an explanation at this vital point. Although the exterior memory may be dominant, the interior is preserved intact, and forth from it may be called whatever ideas and impressions it contains. Granted that the interior memory is spiritually significant, we understand why teachings stored in it may come to the fore, may generate conviction or faith anew, despite the dominant encrustations on the exterior memory.

This view, that the interior memory is significant, accords with the well-known idea of the “saving remnant” in a race or nation which becomes the basis or starting-point for later development. The saving remnant is of profound consequence in the preservation of the teachings recorded in the Bible. Through this remnant, the religious history is made practically continuous, despite the vicissitudes of the nation’s external history. There is plainly a correspondence between the interior life of the individual and that of the nation. Given even a vestige of the better life we once lived, of our more youthful religious habits when we prayed, read the Scriptures and sought to do what is right, this remnant of our spiritual selfhood is ground for hope, for moral and spiritual change, and eventually for a change mode of life affecting the entire selfhood.

In this psychology, the idea of remnants as a plane for spiritual life at a later period becomes a distinct and highly important principle, the doctrine remains (reliquae). These remnants may be defined as influential traces of ideas and experiences, of early impressions and contacts left by association in our spiritual nature.
Although the principle of association is not made so prominent as in other psychologies, an analysis of memory prepares us to see that as much or more depends on the association as on the given idea. If the words “home,” “mother,” and “father” call up endeared memories to the wanderer in a far country who has sunk to lower levels so that a flood of emotion arises within his breast, it is the affectional association which develops one idem of remembrance after another. Consequently, when we teach prayers and scriptural passages to little children, we count very much on the sphere of affection with which we give this instruction. We depend on the atmosphere of the home, the Sunday-school, the special holidays (once “holy” days) when old and young assemble. The spirit wherewith a thing is done is of vital moment. It will form an association when words will not. It will stay when words have gone. Love can form a “remnant.”

Remains are essential to spiritual life, understanding and thought. In general, they compass the field of the goods, from “goods of fancy” and of ignorance to goods of intelligence. But they vary in amount with the individual, although essential to all in that they cause man to be man. The fewer the remains, the less can a man’s scientific and rational possessions become enlightened, but the greater the quantity, the more the individual is differentiated from the brutes. Since they are necessary for man’s regeneration, the remains are conserved intact, apart from adverse factors peculiar to man’s “ownhood.” Their interior significance becomes manifest in the fact that man is regenerated if he suffers himself to be thus renewed. Granted his favoring response, the remains are taken and “remitted into the natural,” to produce correspondence of exteriors with interiors. If man comes into a state of evil, his remains are at once withdrawn and stored away to prevent intermixture with evil. But when he enters a “state of good” his remains are brought into action in his natural mind. This process is preliminary to regeneration.
The process of implantation begins, for instance, when “knowledges of faith” learned in infancy are stored away. These remains are not made manifest until man comes into a state of conflict, so that they are needed. This is especially the case during temptation. Over these vestiges of goods and truths, the Divine will then brood, so that they may be brought to fruition. Though quiescent during the long interval, the remains have made a difference. On them has depended the ability to know what is good and true. They are brought into active play when quickened by a fresh impetus from the Divine influx. In the light of man’s full spiritual stature, remains are seen to be vitally necessary to celestial development.

In a very explicit way Divine goods and truths thus conserved constitute the basis for spiritual memory; hence, for subsequent spiritual knowledge, in contrast with knowledge deriving its subject-matter from the external world and functioning by merely natural processes. These vestiges persist even when man becomes so external that he is unaware of his internal selfhood. Thus, they help to keep man above himself, as he ordinarily thinks of himself. When misfortunes and sickness come, when temptations come, at the hour of death, when a man reaches out for health, these are the occasions when his remains become profoundly influential.

Collateral states follow ideas essential to goods and truths, and truths from the Word impressed on memory. These secondary remains are states of innocence preserved from infancy, such as love towards parents, brothers and sisters, teachers and friends; also, states of charity towards the neighbor, pity for the poor and needy, and other similar states acquired later in life. These remains are also kept intact and are preserved, not as we acquire information by effort, but coming as Divine gifts. Not the least vestige of these, or of the initial or primary remains, is lost. New remains are added to these treasures during regeneration, and the accumulated wealth of goods and truths is perpetuated through the other life.
At first thought, this emphasis on truths and goods laid down as gifts in man’s life seems to contradict the teaching concerning incessant Divine influx in the living present. For man is able through present influx to lift his understanding into spiritual light. But present experience is always limited by man’s attitude, his loves and affections, and the degree of interior openness. Whatever a man’s experience or insight in the hour that now is, he is dependent on memory in all processes of recognition and assimilation of truth. It is his past, living into his present, which makes the hour that now is, impressive and inspiring. Memory as thus implied is dependent on Divine goods and truths already in man’s interiors. Principles which man is unaware of, may be deeply influential.

Again, we have observed that man’s interiors may be closed, his inner life neglected during a period when, as a conscious being, he may be nearly submerged by externals. If he may later be appealed to, there must be some ground in which to sow good seed. Hence, the need for a storehouse of such goods and truths as shall find lodgment during the plasticity of childhood. Only in extremely rare cases does the spiritual degree remain open so that a man may learn directly or anew what for most men is a recovery of long-forgotten instruction, as in old age some people have been rejuvenated in their spiritual experiences by regaining childhood’s habit of prayer. Only in rare cases is spiritual truth a discovery or revelation. For the majority, it is mediated by doctrine, or preserved by remembered values, which serve a purpose comparable to that of a national anthem unheard for many years during life in a foreign land, or a secret hymn heard in childhood, lost to memory, but aroused by later associations with the thrill and enthusiasm which we connect with the home-land. It has been said that even the most hardened criminal may be appealed to by the simple word “mother,” or its equivalent ideal association. There is some mental associate which will arouse any forgotten experience that has made its
sacred appeal. The connection is often due to a special word and the setting which gave to it an ideal context in early life. Thus, the great value of scriptural passages learned by heart is seen. Modern psychology, with its emphasis on the law of association, impressively confirms the teaching that spiritual remnants may be appealed to even when their possessor is unaware that he has them.

Granted this teaching about the remnants of spiritual truths impressed on the mind in childhood, and to be appealed to in connection with later doctrinal instruction, the chief matter to bear in mind is the order of development of man’s powers, and the abilities to be emphasized at the right juncture. Naturally, those who put stress on doctrine as prior to experience, will give precedence to the inculcation of doctrine at vital points. So, the effort to establish right remains, will begin as soon as the child’s mind can receive and retain verses from the Psalms, stories from the Prophets, and brief prayers; followed by the learning of the Commandments and the Beatitudes, and other scriptural passages. In the usual religious instruction of the home and Sunday-school, this process is continuous with the teachings of the Confirmation class, and the final acceptance of the essentials of belief which entitle a person to membership in the Church. The implications throughout is that, as doctrine is first in authority, so intellect or understanding is first to be appealed to through passages learned by heart and belief acquired through appropriate religious association. The general inference is in favor of the power of doctrine in contrast with any other mental associate. If the instruction begins early enough, it will forestall other influences. The hope is reasonably cherished that, when the time comes for the youth to think for himself, he will readily accept the doctrines which should be believed.

Experience and observation teach us, however, that the process is not always so simple as this, otherwise the world would have been Christianized in short order. Ours is just now a non-
doctrinal age. In any event, influence due to doctrinal instruction is one among several factors of mental development in youth and manhood. The instincts, desires, emotions, feelings of pleasure and pain, together with associates due to the imagination (notably in a generation when film-plays abound) are likely to be strongly influential during a considerable period. We are concerned with the whole individual, not with the intellect alone and its associates. Life is a complex of promptings or urges, some involving imitation, rivalry, curiosity, and various ambitions classifiable under the head of self-interest rather than with respect to noble truths. Pleasure-loving is a very large factor, notably in our day when opportunities for pleasure have been enormously increased by mechanical inventions.

Our doctrine emphasizes not only early remains due to doctrine, but the successive promptings of love, with its accompanying affections. In earliest childhood, before intellectual affections can be appealed to, remains are due to responsiveness or obedience. With the beginnings of self-assertion, resistance appears. Obedience then becomes a more difficult matter, especially with certain types. So, life is oftentimes a “game” between teachers and parents, and children who are unruly from motives not really discerned by their elders.

So, the question arises: What underlies this assertiveness? What is the significance of self-love? What place does individuality occupy in mental development? To consider these matters is to remember that there is an active as well as a passive factor in the understanding. Hence, the whole question of the nature of knowledge and rationality in connection with the spiritual life is to be considered before we discern the sphere of doctrine in its profounder relationships. For there is plainly a great difference between what we would like to believe concerning truths that ought to be accepted when an appeal to reason is made, and the actual status of individuals in their complexity, conditions as so many are by habit, environment, and
undisciplined emotions. What we know concerning spiritual vestiges belongs with much else which we are learning about the way the mind works.

Meanwhile, highly significant for our psychology as a whole is the teaching that remains in the primary and secondary senses of the word and are Divine implantations; that it is the Divine influx which keeps these priceless remnants from adverse influences; and that the remains are selectively reviving and utilized by Divine powers operating through the human spirit. Whatever the value of imaginative and affectional associations in the sense of present-day usage, neither the process nor the product as the term “implantation” is here used, is explicable by self-operating associations, or mechanical patterns. We are, then, to regard the associational process as merely instrumental, our part being readiness for Divine selection.

Summarizing these chapters on memory, we note that in the exterior memory, sense-impressions are deposited, and sense-images are laid down in groups or series. There is naturally less order and coherence among impressions thus stored than in the higher memory. States due to sense-experience relate to external things. These states are in striking contrast with remembered states produced in us from within and above, implying the interior memory. The exterior memory might be defined with respect to the Pauline “mind of the flesh.” It is the storehouse of many obscure impressions and ideas circulating about natural-mindedness. All men possess memory to this extent at least. We all know that impressions linger to perplex and disturb us. We know how easy it is to lapse into obscurities, particularly when we are not feeling “up to the mark.” Memory in this sense resists our spiritual progress. We would make little headway in the future if this memory were the sole basis of our operations. But the interior memory, already forming here, is the one utilized in the universal language through which all beings communicate in the spiritual world. This memory has a much richer content, and a greater capacity. “All things
whatever that a man hears and sees, and by which he is affected, are, unknown to man, insinuates as to ideas and ends into his interior memory; and they remain in it, so that not anything perishes; although the same things are obliterated in the external memory.”¹³⁷ This is the Book of Life.

The early chapter of greatest moment receives the implantations known as remains. They inhere in a substance far more enduring than that of the brain, and they relate to the interior memory, or the memory of the “mind of the spirit.” It is the good into which man is initiated when a young child that is permanent.¹³⁸
Chapter 11

Soul and Body

Appearances are so persuasive that most of us speak and act as if bodies were real men and women, with eyes that see, ears that hear and a brain that thinks. In fact, a fallacy has become in our day a truth for those who judge solely by appearances and who adopt the theory known as behaviorism. A body going through certain motions seems to be a man behaving as these motions indicate. The further removed from bodily behavior, attitudes, gestures, and the position and activity of the vocal organs, the less real—so people seem to argue. Hence, our doctrine, with its insistence on the primacy of the spirit, would be called the most absurd of all psychologies now in vogue. The garment does not merely clothe the man, so it would be said: the garment is the man. Consequently, his alleged soul would be deemed an antiquated figure of speech likely to be utterly forgotten when behaviorism has won its final triumph.

It is well to push this fallacy to the limit, so that we may appreciate afresh the doctrine that the soul clothes itself with an organic body as with a garment. Instead of first looking to the positions and motions of the vocal organs, we penetrate to thought within speech, to affection within thought, and inmost states of spirit with the affections by which the central love becomes manifest. The differences between soul and body impress us as radical in the extreme. The body, constituted of material substances, even in the finest tissues of the brain, grows old like a garment, as incapable as a dead thing of generating life of its own, though useful as a receptacle or instrument. It takes on semblances of life only because life flows through it from spiritual
sources. The soul consists of substances which have nothing in common with bodily nutrition and decay. Even to begin to regard its nature aright, is to learn that it is quickened by activities which no combination of physical and chemical forces could ever produce, and that it exists in conjunction with the body by the interior relationship known as correspondence. Apparent dependence of soul on body is therefore as far from truth as possible. Communication without participation of substances and forces means that radical difference between soul and body is the clue to follow, not apparent resemblances and supposed identities, as if soul lost substance and force by expressing itself through body.

By considering the fallacy indicated above, we see how this psychology meets the ancient difficulty known as the “chasm between soul and body.” The chasm seems greater than ever when we put behaviorism over against the psychology of the soul. Hence, the assumptions of students of human nature in our day who make light of all crucial issues by merely asserting that man is a “behaving organism,” so-called mind being without the slightest efficacy.

Present-day thought does not revert to the view of an alleged “pre-established harmony” between soul and body, as if the two co-existed on a level of equality. Yet, when the discussion swings to the outer extreme, classifying bodily behavior as appearance in contrast with the influx of the soul into the body as reality, we seem to confront a difficulty as great as in the ancient theories. For the moment, influx by correspondences, without interchange of substances or forces, seems as hard to envisage as the idea of parallel relation between soul and body prearranged at creation. If there is no blending of spiritual life from the soul with physical and chemical energies in the brain, how can a volitional impulse (act of will in relation to an affection) be translated into action or thought into speech? We seem forced to conclude that, between substances so different, the one implying the spiritual world, the other the natural, there
must be an intermediary of some sort to account for the remarkable partnership; for example, when a man through speech apparently puts himself into his words. If there is no influx by continuity, what does influx by contiguity mean? Continuity signifies unbroken flow. Contiguity signifies nearness. But such nearness looks, for the moment, as if there were still a “chasm” between thought and matter.

Some students of this doctrine have assumed that the difficulty is cleared away by introducing from Swedenborg’s earlier psychology the idea of a limbus (border) as an intermediate entity or force between mind and brain, by way of explanation of the transference of activities on the mental side, so that corresponding changes shall be initiated or aroused on the part of the brain. But it has been objected that an intermediate element is then added which would require another mediating principle, and thus on indefinitely. The difficulty is that, granted two substances which are unlike (mind and brain), a third substance which is different in type and texture will then require other mediating substances distinct in quality; hence, an indefinite number of graduated substances.

Various theories concerning an intermediate substance resembling both mind and matter have, indeed, found acceptance from time to time, notably the view entertained by Paracelsus in the Middle Ages, with which Swedenborg was doubtless familiar. No recent attempts to bridge the chasm in this way have been made, because the tendency of psychology is in the direction of breaking down all distinctions between mind and matter on the ground that both belong to the same system of energies, some events being physical, others psychical. Hence, the popularity of the neutral term “psychophysical” as a convenient mode of concealing ignorance. Plainly, such terms tend as far as possible from the doctrine of degrees, which later chapters will show are essential to our psychology. According to this teaching, the qualities of mind are preserved
intact, without vague notions of any sort concerning the alleged blending of psychical energies with physical, and without assuming any identity of substance between mind and brain, to the great disadvantage of the mind.

Although the relationship between mind and brain was a problem for our seer’s earlier psychology in much the same way as it perplexed other scholars, it was not a problem for his later psychology. For he came into clear perception of the stages of descent of the Divine influx; also, into knowledge of the body with which the spirit is clothed in the life after death. The question of the spiritual body, as in process of formation within the physical body, is distinct from that of the specific relation between mind and brain already mentioned. The spiritual body has its “border.” In this sense, the spiritual body bears intimate relation with both spirit and body. But what takes place in this border-relation at death is a subject to be considered by itself, granted a description of the successive spiritual states through which man passes after death. The chief fact for the moment is that, after death, man retains a “certain limbus from the purest things of nature” around the “spiritual from the father.”139 This doctrine of the limbus or border is not extended by Swedenborg to cover the whole mind-body relation.

Returning to the question of the relation between states of mind and brain in the ordinary events of our natural existence, we observe that based on principles already laid down, we start with the fact of influx from mind to brain without any “chasm” between mind-event and brain-event. Essential to knowledge of this relation is not the mere acquaintance with mind and brain, which people usually possess, but revealed knowledge of realities higher in the scale. First in significance in this connection, is the truth concerning Divine influx as Love-Wisdom operating into man’s two receptacles, will and understanding.140 “All influx is of life and operates through its receptacles.” Granted this more interior relationship, we are prepared to follow the secondary
relations, such as the influx through the mind into speech, and a similar influx into actions. We consider the fact that the soul, or spirit in man, consists of “superior spiritual substance.” By contrast, the body is from the substances of nature, called material, receiving an inferior influx mediately through the natural world. The body is always to be understood as serving the soul for “vehicles and means” through which the soul may “produce its effects in the natural world.”

It is clear, then, that we must think from Divine truths or principles, not mere psychical or material facts. We proceed with caution in trying to envisage the transmissive process from soul into mind, and from mind into body, reminding ourselves that mind and brain are different degrees. Although contiguous, mind and brain never blend, as if by an infinitely minute process of shading off from light to darkness, in which all differences are lost. Nor do they blend in the sense that either mind or brain might be said to lose something in substance or energy to the other. The truth that mind and brain correspond, although different, is fundamental. The influx from soul to body accomplishes its end without carrying mind into brain, as if mind could become brain-tissue or cerebral vibration. Mind is already in the brain (in “first principles”) in substances which arouse corresponding activities in the substances of the brain. Just how this can be in spiritual fact, so that every detail of the relation is seen, is, of course, a perceptual discovery possible only to those whose spiritual eyes are open. But the details of paramount interest on the part of those who would, as it were, pry into the whole process, and catch it in the act, are not vital matters for those who would discern what is spiritually central and decisive.

The practical consideration with which we are all concerned, is that the soul acts through and into the body so that, to will (on the mental side), is for the body to respond accordingly (on the physical side). The other significant fact is that activities coming thorough the brain from the world around the body, contribute all that is essential by way of subject-matter for sense-
perception. Real events occur round about these bodies of ours. Real images report these events within the mind, contributing items for memory-knowledge, which is man’s ordinary knowledge of the world. There is no ground for inferring that the body, in thus conveying its items to be assimilated by the mind, has any power to act on the mind, as if mind were either a product of brain, or a receptacle wrought out of material substances by organic evolution, instead of coming by Divine descent through creation from higher to lower.

The prevalent theory of interaction between mind and brain attributes the efficiency, or life, to body and mind, without looking beyond. For our seer, both action and reaction are relative terms. Even in case of the inmost, the soul does not, strictly speaking, react as we ordinarily use the term. It receives. So, when the soul is said to act into the body, this is not an originating, but a transmissive mode of activity. Mind, apparently reacting, responds by means of the activity with which it is endowed. The body is even less capable of acting or reacting as if in its own right, even though, to all appearances, the body acts and the mind seems to react as if a product of the body.

To say that all activity is relative is not, however, to underestimate or negate the fact that a real transmission occurs, although taking place by an influx which preserves the integrity of the media through which it operates. Difficulties begin at once and increase all along the line, if our thought starts with events in space and time, thus with body and brain, wondering how an event like the moving of a freight car on a railway track can be translated into the mental activity of a series of images. From that approach, we indeed require a sort of limbus to infill the chasm. But when we picture the situation from within and above, by beginning with the principle of Divine influx as universal, we understand why the term limbus is scarcely mentioned after the period of
Swedenborg’s illumination. We also begin to see the significance of the term “fiber,” which means both a physiological unit and a correspondential principle.

This twofold reference to fibers is confusing at first. For example, we read about joy “diffusing itself through the fibers, and thence into the congregated fibers . . . so that the fiber is as it were nothing but joy and delight.” But, fiber is used in a purely physiological sense when it is said that the exterior memory is “formed . . . in the substances which are the beginnings of the fibers.” The organs are woven out of vessels and fibers and, from these, originate the ducts and lesser glands. The animal spirit receives its determination and form by means of the fibers. So, too, both muscles and nerves consist of fibers, the fibers being fundamental with respect to both substance and motion.

To picture bodily processes in their complete relationship, is to note the progression of the fibers and vessels from their beginnings, wherein life acutely resides, to their various functions from within-outward, in more explicit language: from “primes” to “ultimates.” On the mental side there is a corresponding progression in sensations, thoughts, and affections. Hence, even the minutest activities of will and understanding “flow into acts” by means of the fibers in such a way that the distinctive features of these mental processes are preserved. The influx is general through the coverings of the fibers, “most particular” through the purest fibers. Reciprocally, there is an activity through the muscles and motor fibers into the items of thought. Thus, the mind is informed concerning external events. The beginnings of fibers in the head coincide with mental states due to will-action, so that the integrity of brain-events and mind-events is preserved, despite the appearance which language sometimes suggests that fibers are more real than the perpetual endeavors of the will to which the beginnings of their motions correspond. To say that the will acts in ultimates, ultimates being the last terms on the mental
side, is not then to describe will in its entirety, as a later chapter will show. There is continuity within the brain-series. There is continuity within the mental series. But the latter continuity accords with the reception of life from its Divine sources; this life is spiritual and is not in any sense a product of fibers. In brief, the “spiritual is within the natural as a fiber is within the muscle.” The spiritual accompanies every fiber of heart and lungs but is neither lost within nor identical with it.

We are now prepared to understand otherwise difficult passages in which the term “fiber” is used with respect to correspondences. Granted that truth becomes good, so that the two make as it were one body, the soul of which is good, such truths are describable as “spiritual fibers which form the body.” Fibers in this sense of the word signify inmost forms proceeding from goods, while nerves typify truths. We see, then, why “truths of faith” implanted in man’s heart are the new fibers there. To carry out the figure, is to remember that as it is “life” which builds the fibers in man’s body, so it is a higher life which builds truths and goods in his spirit, disposing them into forms according to uses. We may then develop the comparison without limit, taking as our clue the fact that, when man lives according to truths, these truths appear like fibers, “full of spirit.” As truths have good in them and, in this sense live, so a fiber (also a vessel and the blood) lives in so far as it has spirit in it. We may take the clue from goods and truths, from man’s inner response to these, or from the progressive stages of man’s externalizing effort to live by these principles.

Plainly, very much is herein supplied by doctrine of which man in his actual experience is unaware. Man does not know by feeling or sense-perception that a thousand motor fibers concur in the process which is known by him as a single motion. Nor does he know that, in accepting goods and truths, striving to live by them and actively carrying into practice what he
has willed, a thousand details enter his thoughts and affections, each corresponding to the details of the fibers. What is important for him to know, vividly and practically to realize, is that the transmission from the first prime (the initiating volition) to the last bodily deed (as “ultimate”) is by influx. Since fibers represent spiritual things, we know (in general) how the influx takes place from thought and will to action, and how it proceeds from mind to brain. We are not now in danger of lapsing into the notion that this influx is, by continuity, from mind to brain, since it is the principle of correspondences which invariably gives the clue. Explicitly speaking, “interior things do not cohere with exterior ones by continuity, but . . . are conjoined by means of protrusions like fibers, through which are communications.”

All things are in successive order and, thus far, they are distinct. What passes over is through what is fibrous. The greater truth is that, what passes over, is described by reference to degrees, as distinctions in this successive order. In another chapter the principle of the types of degrees will receive more adequate consideration.

We see, then, why the mind-brain relationship is not a problem for this psychology. Instead, it is a specific instance of correlation in the long series from Spirit to matter in its visibly tangible form. As we start from the organic beginnings of the fibers in the brain to follow the bodily sequences, so we must begin with the celestial principle, and turn thence to the spiritual, when making ready to describe mental activity. The antecedent is spiritual, the consequent natural. The cause is spiritual, the resulting process natural. Our study of fibers has given us a very concrete way of envisaging the spiritual as resident in and actuating the natural organism. To understand true causality is, in each case, to return in thought to the nature of spirit, its modes of existence, and the activities springing from it.
Chapter 12

Mental Activity

When studying the human mind in quest of a way to think about it connectedly, we are impressed by the activity which is always in process. To stop this activity long enough to analyze a section of it, would be to find that any unit is describable by the term used at the outset of our study, the inner state. This term stands for both the content of sense-perception, as we become aware of it from moment to moment, and the content which is supplied by what of interpretation of our experiences. In theory (from doctrine), we may then describe successive aspects of such units as they flow from moment to moment. Thus, in the foregoing pages, there have been numerous references to goods and truths by which these units were construed. We do not experience such goods and truths by themselves. What we know by actual experience is the process in which, what is felt, is one with the realities by which it is explained when we have true doctrine.

A passing state as felt might involve little more than comfort or warmth, swiftly giving place to unpleasantness, as when a window or door is opened, and a piercing wind blows in. Within mind and body, much depends upon the way an inner state is construed with reference to an attempt to change its sequences, as a distressing mood continues for hours and hours, despite an effort to rise above it. An inner state may or may not tend to accelerate self-love. If falsities of doctrine intrude to distort a state which otherwise might have passed without disturbance, far more will depend on what is believed than on what is perceived.
Yet, the stream of activity flows on. Something is always in process as we vividly realize when we look back over the happy hours which have filled a day, or the exceedingly miserable ones which have made the day seem insufferably long. By knowledge of the way the mind works in its changes of state and variations of form, we can add to such a history of a day. We can describe the successive hours by reference to what we know about bodily and nervous changes. We may add to the account by regarding the passing states as mental only. Or, we may interpret the experiences of the day as spiritual: by a “spiritual” state, we obviously mean one that is significant, that has value. In any case, all states are “inner states,” whether viewed in correspondence with bodily events and conditions or regarded in terms of influx supplied by doctrine. Any experience through which man passes is, in simplest terms, an inner state in relation to this basic activity. Consider, for example, an emotion of envy with the affections implied in it, a desire in line with an instinctive trend, a decisive choice or act of will, or a stirring thought. Each change of state interrupts or harmonizes with other states with their affiliated affections. The state which is just now entering the field of consciousness, and about to disappear, was preceded by other states in the activity-stream. The state which precedes, contains the germ of the one that follows. Each one involves relations which are far from evident until we inquire deeply into a person’s life-history, as a complex series of inner states.

We are prepared, then, for the proposition that all mental activities are “changes of state and derivations of form.”

Incoming states are due to changes, both in the influent series as such, and in the forms implied. The internal form of man is continually changing as the state of his life changes. All states have existence in the forms which the states induce. This would not be a fact, however, unless there was also a certain persistence or centrality amidst all this variety. That is to say, the activity of will-understanding implying man’s nature as spirit, is more central
than the passing mental states which are in incessant change. All inner states, in the profounder sense of the word, are states of love or affection. All thoughts as states are derivations from the affections due to the love which they imply. Hence, there are both states of love, and their related states, and states of the understanding with their relationships. States of charity belong in the first of these groups, states of faith in the second; in other words, states of goods and truths. So, descriptively speaking, goods and truths are always changing the states and forms of the mind.153

Any “state of life” is also both a state of affection, and a state of thought. Furthermore, as man’s states of life are both internal and external, by “state” is specifically meant his love as internal, and by “changes of state,” the affections of love and thought which, when carried into actual expression, pertain to what is external. Some states are plainly “peculiar and proper” to man in his externality. Some are obviously transitory, while others involve man’s affiliation with social groups, thus with the spiritual world. In fine, the states of which man is conscious (as moments of passing experience) relate to numerous interrelated series of states of which he is by no means aware. Amidst the trivial, there is always the relatively permanent, that is, the states which indicate the stage of development or enlightenment which the individual has attained.

Simplifying for the moment, then, we are now chiefly concerned with the mental activity which is unceasingly in process. It follows from the foregoing, that all motion in any aspect of mental life, is change in states. Thus, all processes, all effects due to influx of any kind, all influences attributable to the two worlds, as well as all results wrought by man’s reactions to the Divine life, belong within this far-reaching activity. We have then a single picture, so to speak, of man’s inner life.

Sensation, for example, is primarily a change of state; however, sensations may vary in quality, whatever their quantity, the number of sense-organs, or any other aspect of or sensibility.
Like all other mental states, sensations are intelligible in their series, thus, in relation to the natural world, to the body of the recipient, to his perceptions, his natural mind, and thus to his natural existence. Again, all experiences of other types than those of mere sense-perception, are received according to the states of the recipient, in their series. Thus, the law of correspondence once more comes into view, since each series is correspondential. Our nature or makeup equips us for all this relatedness, on the various planes of experience. The vitalizing influx yields the requisite activity. Within the activity-stream, the various states (as mental) come and go. The states of life are determinants in this stream. Any occurrence, such as the experience which is just now absorbing our attention, is conditioned by the recipient states which meet it. What is obvious to all of us in case of an affection which, like joy or sorrow, colors our mental world for the time being, so that we live in the little mental sphere of our own passing states, is no less true of all states of response or reaction in which we are wholly unaware of the part we play in meeting the experiences in question. Unthinkingly, we assume that things and events around us affect us just as these occurrences and objects seem to exist, as if our own states made no difference. As unthinkingly, we neglect the fact of our ruling love with its allied affections, our prevailing state of the understanding with its intellectual allies. Our whole mental activity, from what is most external to what is most internal, confirms to this law of intimate relatedness to states and their series.

To make the picture of the present moment of sense-experience as nearly complete as possible, therefore, we presuppose activities of which we are not conscious; the activity of the soul into the mind, of the mind into the body through the brain, and the activities resident in the sense-organs. The activity which we know as consciousness, in turn, presupposes the Divine activity, without which we could neither think nor feel.
We are made aware of activity as mental by experience. We are taught the existence of Divine influx as prior to doctrine. We share with all creatures the ability to respond. By doctrine, we learn that this activity is never original or independent; at best, we are recipients, whatever the appearance to the contrary. Hence, the central truth is that it is everywhere and always the Divine that acts and, by acting, causes all reactions as responses according to type, plane, or degree. Only in appearance does the power to react belong to any created organism by itself.

The appearance that man acts from himself is, indeed, significant. There is a respect in which man should always act “as if” his action was from himself, in its entirety; thus, a reason why his states of reaction must always be taken into account. Indeed, no appearance is better grounded than the notion that he acts from himself. Each of us can seemingly prove it by at once consulting the activities that are now going on within us. Moreover, our wills seem wholly ours. Apparently, each of us is producing and sustaining the activity which, moment by moment, is essentially what we mean by mental life. Yet even the least of these moments is shared, is cooperative, or else it is antagonistic. For by doctrine we learn that there is an inveterate tendency of the natural mind to react against the spiritual, or higher mind, and that man in every moment tends to relapse toward self-love or hell, even while ostensibly he is creating his own heaven. Hence, strictly speaking, it is out of the question to describe even the simplest experience of response to natural things and events around us without taking the interrelatedness of our inner states into account, supplying from doctrine what is not given by experience.

The more steadily we give ourselves to appearances, the more easily we interpret our activity as if it were primarily our own. But the more fully we give ourselves to doctrine concerning the spiritual life, the more we find the whole picture changing. If the spiritual mind, for example, is closed, the natural mind reacts against heaven, and man is in a spiritual state such
that his mental or passing states are affected. A man may be subject to hereditary evil, arrogating power to himself, intensifying his self-love, and thus heightening his reactions against heavenly influx. When his inner state is of this sort, his passing mental states are conditioned accordingly; hence, his modes of reaction. Thus, all apparent reaction, as if man’s power were original or independent, is subject to a radically different interpretation when the whole picture is before us. On the other hand, reactions indicating genuine response to goods and truths splendidly exemplify wise responsiveness, thus cooperation with the Divine influx. The central consideration in any case is that man, in receiving life essential to his existence by Divine influx, reacts in and through his life, as if acting from himself. God’s activity through us varies with the mode, quality, and type of response in the organ or vessel fitted for its recipiency.

Naturally enough, we are interested in our mental activity, as if even the most important changes in attitude or conduct were primarily our own, for example, in case of a momentous decision to abide hereafter in the Divine Love and Wisdom as the true basis of character. But even here, the activity is significant, because man “permits” himself to be acted upon; in reality, he responds to life from the Lord in the “inmost.”

In general, this activity from the Lord is, first, action upon inmost, then from inmost to outmosts, but also from outmosts simultaneously.\textsuperscript{154} This activity is not, then, upon any particular phase of man’s nature by itself; it is in and through his nature as a whole, by the outgoing process from inmost which yields the essential life in all aspects of his activity. Man is aware of those phases of his subsequent response which, in the Divine Providence, it is right for him to know.

Granted the foregoing distinctions, we are prepared to follow Swedenborg in the description of any phase of inner activity which is characteristic of his psychology. We note, for
example, that any apparently single action, such as a definite prompting to do a kind deed, with man’s response to this prompting, is accompanied by a simultaneous action of which he is unaware. This is partly because the doer is absorbed in the anticipated deed as a unit, in its realization in actual conduct, so that the deed seems to be detached. In reality, all parts of man’s nature are in intimate connection, action as one, in spirit, mind, and body. This relatedness is also true within the spirit, in the mind, and in the body; and of spirit and body in their general relationship. It is far truer of the Divine activity for while the Lord acts upon every particular in man, the Lord’s action is also universal, and includes all single activities in one whole.

Moreover, the apparent acts are qualified by the fact that the Divine action is often against the will of man, since man is in various respects out of accord with Divine Order. Indeed, Providence always acts against man’s own love.155 Man cannot even resist from his own power.156

The endeavor toward action from within is incomplete by itself. The power and strength consist in the definite external acts which make the inner process effective. The endeavor or effort from within may indeed exert power through motion toward some end which a man wishes to attain, as in dramatic activity intended as an expression of emotion. But there is power neither in the endeavor alone, nor in the force by which the inner impetus is carried into execution; power is in the conjoint action which is the product of the two.157 In other words, the mind’s interiors have no power save through organic forces, by which the interior activities are realized in a definite or concrete way; the power resides in the extremes or outposts, in which there is conjunction.158 It is in these outermosts, especially, that the power belongs to the Lord as life, whatever the appearance to the contrary, when man seems to contribute the efficiency from secret recesses of his own selfhood.
To say all this, is not to deny relative activity at any point. Man’s endeavor from within does, indeed, produce action in so far as the interior comes forth and subsists. The efficiency from will and understanding, which is resident in the endeavor, which gives a line of action its directive impetus, is not denied. It is evident enough that when man thinks and wills, the organs “move themselves suitably;” that is, the organs apparently move of themselves. The will, indeed, “flows into action through muscular forms.” So, the will moves the muscles of the entire body, moves thousands of scattered fibers to produce one action, the basis of action being in the fibers. Hence, there is apparently a mechanical aspect to all action through the body, as in gestures which accompany man’s speech, and seem to be purely automatic, the several motions being joined as mechanical things are put together. But, behind the seemingly mechanical motions, is the fact that the visible movements are “forms of the will shown before the eyes.” Hence, deeds, in general, are visible evidences of our volitions. The soul, or life of the deed, is from the will. Nothing really lives in the deeds except the will; there is nothing real in the motions save the endeavor from within. The motivation of our deeds is the direct clue; the will is often far more important than the deed. While, then, Swedenborg describes overt behavior in such a way that even the mechanical philosophers might be satisfied, he invariably penetrates behind the appearance to the inwardness to which such behavior is due.

An overt motion, like a gesture, corresponds to a state of thought; back of the thought is the endeavor, and within the endeavor is the influx. On the Divine side is the influx. On the human is the responsive endeavor which leads to acts and motions in the external expression of the will. There is one life everywhere active, although in the receptacle which is actuated, it is differently received, and different terms, such as “will” and “endeavor,” are used, and a different order or sequence is followed. When man acts from the understanding, for example, the
intellectual activity precedes, and the will follows. But whatever a man does from the understanding, he achieves through the will. Thus, in case of a truth adopted by the understanding and made a motive for action, the will element is from the “goods” which give to truth its efficiency. In other words, the good is what acts, while truth suffers itself to be acted upon

Still more explicitly, the mind acts continuously in end, cause, and effect. That these three may act as one, there must be correspondence, so that the end shall be in the cause, and actuate it as the determining purpose. Thus, heavenly love is an end; the will to realize it in concrete deeds becomes a cause; while the deed actually done is the effect. When there is correspondence in the sense of harmony between God and man, the love flows readily into the will, the will into action, and thus the three act as one.

The same relationship is exemplified in nature. Rightly interpreted, there is always activity from the spiritual world. The force, endeavor, or motion is part of the process of which we see the visible or tangible effect. In man, the spiritual element is more explicit; that is the union of thought and will, the subsequent action being in the sphere of the natural world. The end determines the action and gives quality to it. We might illustrate by an act of service done for a person in distress. The influx from the Divine life passes first into the perception which discloses the objective, thence into the will, and then into the deed or good work.

It is necessary to make the description of the sequential activity thus explicitly clear in order to avoid all confusion when we come to the study of the moral and spiritual value, or significance of man’s conduct. The action cannot, for instance, result without the will since, in that case, it would be God alone acting, without any instrumentality. The action is Divine-human. The internal principle of the action, humanly speaking, is in very truth, the will,
resultant deed being the aggregate and containant of all that went before. As the deed could not take place at all without the will, so without the understanding, it would have no specific quality. Granted a mind wholly in accord with Divine Order, the resulting action at each stage would be from the Divine; it would not be marred by anything human. Activity in man in its fullness would then correspond to the Divine Proceeding or Spirit, that is, God in action.

Both the activity and the response in man, however, are limited. In other words, there is an active and a passive element, an active and a reactive. The activity, we have seen, is not creatable, is not original with man— as if there were an innate spontaneity capable of producing variations of form and substance, or new types of response. As a recipient of life, man is endowed with capacities so that, in receiving the Divine, he is unaware of the passive element (does not know himself as “receptacle”), and so he readily assumes that there is activity only (his own). So, too, man is unaware of the operation by influx of the soul into the body and, hence, there are linkages which he does not cognize by experience or feeling. Again, the apparently independent action of the soul, which appears to be general, is detailed, as already shown in previous chapters, in which the relation of soul and body have been considered.

It is not, of course, necessary for practical purposes to bear all these details in mind. What is needed is knowledge of the part we play in the activity process, so that our endeavor shall be truly cooperative, with an ever-present realization of the source of the life which finds expression through our best responses. Given this realization, we may dedicate ourselves more fully to the highest incentives, taking no credit to ourselves.

Given the complete picture of the activity process, so that we see what is essential, guarding against appearances, we are prepared to understand the term “receptacle,” a word which some readers of Swedenborg have found very obscure.
Since there is but one source of life or power, all finite beings as recipients must have organs or vehicles of response. Man at large is organized for such recipiency, and each organ is a vessel or containant as a basis for its specific operations, notably in the physical body. The psychological term for such a receptacle is “faculty,” a term which has so long been in vogue that there would seem to be no excuse for misunderstanding. Thus, will and understanding, although sometimes referred to as receptacles for Divine Love and Wisdom, are described as faculties of assimilation and response. In lesser measure, any mental principle, organ, plane, or mode of response and expression is a receptacle; hence, this term becomes intelligible to us only in case we penetrate behind it to the activity which finds manifestation through it. The physical eye, for example, is the organ of vision; it receives both the degree of energy which makes possible its function, and the kind of vibration connected with sense-perceptions of the visual type. But the eye does not see; man sees through visual perception, by aid of life which is more than physical. There are organs and vessels of recipiency and transmission all down the line to the lowest form of receptacle. The higher the type, the more reason for considering the function that is fulfilled.

Given this teaching concerning a system of receptacles organized according to function, with will and understanding at the top of the scale, we once more see how and why there is a single efficiency at work in every part of our nature. As a created being manifesting life, man is, in brief, a highly organized system of this sort, each receptacle being reactive according to its type. The recipient vessels of each level or plane are so constituted that Divine life can flow in, the lower plane being made alive by the one above it.

The term “vessel” or “receptacle” thus has a much wider meaning than it would have if it were construed literally, on the assumption that a receptacle is like a bowl. Recipiency is not
limited by shape or space, although limited by capacity. It is limited by the function fulfilled, notably in case of the understanding, in giving form to activities transmissively emphasized by the will. It is the centralizing activity coming from above which involves the principle of explanation, not the structure of the receptacle, notably in the conjoint action of spirit, mind, and body acting as one; also, in the celestial, spiritual, and natural, which concur and unite. Man’s natural plane receives no life except from the spiritual, nor his spiritual save from the celestial, which, in turn, receives no life “except from the Lord alone, who is Life itself. The natural is a receptacle which receives, or a vessel into which is poured the spiritual, and the spiritual is a receptacle or vessel into which is poured the celestial.”

As man, in general, is an organ or vessel which receives Divine life, so in the interior of his nature, are small receptacles which become tempered and subdued, yielding and compliant. The recipient vessels of the memory are formed by means of knowledges and, when these receptacles are opened, further knowledge can enter. Thus, truths once apprehended become organic forms recipient of other truths. The possessions of a man’s memory and his affections receive ideas according to the variations of form and changes of state of the mind.

The same process continues from the spiritual into the rational, and thence into the natural. The recipient vessels in the external, formed by means of knowledge pertaining to the outer world, are not only receptacles for natural information or facts, but constitute a basis for spiritual truths. These knowledges derived from the outside world are not spiritual truths, as such, but recipient forms in the memory which may be utilized. So, knowledge learned in early childhood, is a basis for spiritual truth, in accordance with the general principle of “remains.” Receptacles filled with falsities obviously cannot be vessels for truth. But truth is attracted by, and can abide in its like, and love of higher things quickens capacity for incoming truths.
Plainly, the term receptacle or vessel is in an important respect a figure of speech, the higher we go in the scale. To take it literally, would be to miss the dynamic or actively responsive phase of man’s nature, putting all the emphasis on the passivity phase. It would be possible to take this term so literally that the whole doctrine of influx, with its practical values, would become a dead letter. This seems to be precisely what some Swedenborgians have done. The worst instance is seen in the doctrinaire who spends all his time considering how certain doctrines should be construed, in contrast with “doers of the word,” who realize that the real test is in the fruits that follow.

This whole psychology is dynamic in type. It is a doctrine of activity centering about the cardinal truth that “love is the life of man.” Hence, the starting-point is always with Love as Divine Essence, organized as Wisdom as the sole source of life, power, and love in man. Man, created by Love through Wisdom, is formed to participate in Love, which is his life. Love is the dynamic of all modes of celestial, spiritual, and natural modes of life. As the central principle, it discloses the nature and scope of intelligence. It is implied in every mental element, as in the entire structure of the human spirit.

The human spirit is man as a participant in Love. Will is intelligible to us if we start with this truth concerning Love. Love as intuition, is celestial and spiritual perception. Love’s affections vitalize the understanding, and these affections in relation to sense perception utilize the brain as its physical organ. Thus, the whole system of receptacles is ritualized. Love is central to the whole sphere of mental activity which we have been describing, thus the principle involved in man’s inner states, notably those that are in process of change from moment to moment. Indeed, we may safely infer that even the element of passivity before mentioned is intelligible only in the light of its relation to love-will as active. The do-nothing individual, with
stereotyped mind and constrained attitude, is therefore to be regarded as inadvertently an active person, blocking the way, “standing pat,” and self-righteously waiting for the world to come to his terms.

The unity of activities grounded in love, and using organs fitted to its purpose, is indeed a gradational scale of descent from Divine Love, each principle being intelligible in terms of this, its centralizing life. Thus, Love as incoming life, is influx. Love in its correspondences, as the correlation of cause and effect, is the principle of association between mind and body. The doctrine of degrees discloses love in its contrasts, its forms of descent and ascent, and the stages through which love achieves its end. Finally, love, in relation to its receptacles, organs, or faculties formed for its uses, discloses its imbuing qualities, enlisting or seeking to enlist complete response. Man’s being from moment to moment is sustained by this indwelling Love, infilling his own love-nature, renewing him so that each pulsation of life, each rhythm of activity within him, is from the same Divine source. Thus, the whole psychology may be thought out in systematic form and expounded in terms of love as its dynamic. The psychology, in turn, follows from the doctrine of the Lord as the Divine individuating itself in the human, the race, with its series, orders, or groups constituting a society, purposefully or potentially in the Divine Providence a heaven. The central truth of the whole is thus the principle which, in detail, underlies each moment of our inner activity.
Chapter 13
The Nature of Spirit

Three more or less conflicting ideas of human personality have prevailed among most educated people. From physiology, biology, and other special sciences, we have acquired a view which seems to point to the cessation of mental life with the death of the body. Yet our religious faith has given us the conviction that the soul is immortal; hence, it cannot be wholly dependent on the mind, if mind fully depends on, or is due to the body. Again, our religious faith has approached the question by maintaining, if mind is dependent on the body, human personality will survive by becoming what is called, somewhat vaguely, a “spirit.” Meanwhile, if we have studied philosophy, we have found still another approach by pleading for the inherent reality of the “self,” a term which has meanings unlike those associated with “soul” or “spirit.” Certain qualities have been attributed to the self by analysis of inner experience, which seems to guarantee its immortality, especially when the question of the future life turns upon the conviction that there are “eternal verities,” and that consequently a “realm of values” exists to which the self belongs by deeply interior relationships. What then is the relationship between that part of us which we hope will not perish, the soul which is somehow spirit, and the self which is profoundly real because it possesses moral freedom and independence of space and time?

Some thinkers have tried to resolve these issues by looking upon the soul as a kind of energizing “atom” or spiritual “monad,” consisting of an immutable substance which is not due
to anything material. This idea of a substance not produced by physical forces or bodily processes has had much to commend it. Spirit must obviously be something other than the ethereal or flame-like entity, so unsubstantial that it is likely to be dissipated at death. The self as a constructive conception built up out of this or that series of facts discerned by analysis appears to be no less vague, without even a ghostly body wherein it might survive. So, too, character has appeared to be a very indefinite term in all theories turning upon the idea of moral survival alone. Moreover, the question has constantly recurred: At what point does the soul separate from the body? Does the soul with the mental elements surviving with it suddenly become a spirit at death? Is a spiritual body bestowed upon the awakening spirit as an actor makes a swift change of costume behind the scenes?

The present doctrine cuts deeply into these issues by insisting on a central unity which knows no interruption or miraculous change, however momentous death appears to be. Man is first and always a spirit, created as a substance which no force or event can destroy. The spirit is already assembling the elements of the future body while here in the natural world. There is already an integration of mind in process of formation, due to those modes of activity which been identified with the inward man as his own, with an appropriate memory in no wise produced by bodily conditions alone. So, too, the kind of life a man has been living already indicates what is to survive, though not through character, as this term is often used. Soul and spirit are one, both here and there, although it is convenient to retain both terms. The word “self” is scarcely applicable, because this is not a speculative system depending on analysis and inferences. Nor is the doctrine of the spirit in man derived by setting ideal values apart, in contrast with temporal matters of fact. Instead, the whole doctrine begins with the eternal source of all values, all truths and goods, in one Essence-in-itself.
Spirit, as both substance and inherent power of response to the Lord, response to man, and to the events and activities of both the spiritual world and the natural, is not then a mere object of religious faith. Granted the open vision of celestial and spiritual insight, it is perceptible as a real being: as loving, willing, thinking, acting, and as related to kindred spheres in both worlds. In the larger sense, spirit includes mind, the spiritual or inward mind, equipped with all essential powers for fullness of life, and in this meaning of the term, distinguishable from the natural mind with its externalities and limited memory. Hence, the spirit has more abilities and qualities than we ever know by ordinary experience. It is impossible, in fact, rightly to regard and depend upon the spirit unless the meagerness of experience is supplemented or corrected by the doctrine discerned from far beyond the utmost reaches of such experience. For purposes of convenience, we may use the expression substance-energy to indicate that the spirit is both created substance and endowed activity, enabling man as a spiritual being to exercise his several functions, designated, in brief, as spirit-functions. Mental functions, on the other hand, may be actuated by the spirit from within, through Divine influx; or, these may be intimately related to the body, which manifests nature-functions only, the connection with influx being much less direct.

Spirit is the complete human being whom we describe in part by various terms, such as personality. Hence, this word primarily means all that enters the endowment for both worlds, for two-world experience, whether the given individual knows anything about this two-foldedness or not, whether the interior degree is open. Potentially, the spirit is already a child of the Lord, fitted for participation in a heavenly society. The given individual may be in a state of spiritual quiescence, with closed interiors, even an attitude and mode of life antagonistic to everything heavenly. However real and habitually active the external senses or sensibilities may be, in
deepest truth such powers or organs are at best mere counterparts of the spiritual senses with their potential functions which would be active had their possessor been quickened into life from the Lord. While ordinary psychology assumes the existence of bodily conditions and processes whenever describing mental activity (as if it were essentially biological), in this doctrine what is invariably presupposed in this or that aspect of the subject at hand, for the moment is the whole man as spiritual in equipment. The physical senses could not function without the bodily organs. But the spiritual senses are capable of functioning whether the soul has left the body.

As adapted to the natural world, spirit possesses the requisite abilities for operation through mind and brain, also for receiving stimuli due to the interaction of natural forces and events, that is, the occurrences of daily existence to which we adapt ourselves at times, much as if we were mere bodies moving about in space. Some of these abilities we know little or nothing about, for example, the way in which spirit, quickened by influx, imbues the mind and thus the body. Even if we could perceive the actual processes by feeling or experiencing them, we would know scarcely anything about their nature or operation unless we were enlightened concerning influx, correspondence, and degrees. For the most part, it suffices when considering the nature of spirit, to bear in mind what is taking place within: the influx of Love-Wisdom into will-understanding, since all that follows is dependent on this. Divine influx contributes the efficiency, correspondence is the law of manifestation, and spirit as substance-energy, fulfills its being through its several functions, extending even to what is most physical in an overt way.

Man, ostensibly lives in the body, on whose functions he seems solely to depend. Yet, he is the more truly in the spiritual world as a spirit, however remote his interior relationship may appear to be. In spirit, man is already in the light of heaven, while his body is in the light of the natural world. Spirit is his greater reality however he construes his material existence. For spirit
is the internal (inward) man, with befitting interiors or characteristics. The inward man lives in a measure above space and time, so that spirit knows not what age is, is neither worn away, nor added to, by the vicissitudes of this earthly existence. Although submitting to natural experiences of every sort, sometimes submerged, with the interiors wholly closed, the spirit is capable of being touched in the inmost, and set free from bondage; hence, perfected in what is worthwhile, even though the corporeal life is decreasing, and many conditions are apparently unfavorable.  

Spirit has form because, as a principle of unity, it is distinctively one in type and interior relatedness. This unity would be impossible without form as the basis and as containing the reality of its respective qualities, the powers which fit man for life in two worlds. As a child of Spirit, man has a form which unites qualities in marked contrast, adapted to this twofold relationship. This unity is not then in any sense that of mere likeness throughout, as would be the case if the spirit were an atom or monad. Spiritual existence in the one world is a different degree from the natural existence of the other. The human body is the most marvelous instance we know in the natural world of *variety in unity*. But the body is wholly one degree, entirely constituted for existence in nature, dependent on sustenance from without, and perishing with the decay of its tissues when the most vital organ ceases to function. Spirit needs no nourishment from mundane sources, and its “food for thought” is taken up into an organism capable of existing apart from space and time.

Spirit, as substance, is intelligible only so far as, taking our clue from Love and Wisdom, we first look to man’s source as Essence or enduring Reality. The Lord, as Substance, is manifested to man as Life in the inmost, where He dwells. Since the inmost is the heart where no barrier arises, and no interpreter translates the language of the Spirit into a less intelligible tongue, the Divine influx is immediate. Man receives goods from Goodness itself and partakes of
what is true from Truth, although unaware of either Goodness or Truth in their ineffable purity. Goodness and Truth, Love and Wisdom, are present in the inmost in their unity. The goods and truths which are apprehended by man have already become diversified.

The inmost, where the Lord governs man’s whole spiritual progress, is both the entrance of the Lord, and the dwelling-place, which makes heaven in its true estate always “within,” never a “place,” like a world in space and time. Through this relationship, commanding the interiors which constitute man’s character, man is capable of being raised into spheres above the natural plane. Thus, he may be stirred by Love, quickened by Life, enlightened by Wisdom, so that he may respond in his affections, will, thought, and action, if so minded. Here is the real source of the activities of will and understanding with their derivatives in the processes of which man is made aware by experience. Hence, there is the best of reasons for bearing these implicit or hidden activities in mind when we analyze motives which enable man to reason and speak, to manifest through his conduct affections and thoughts which seem to be solely his own. Since the Divine influx is immediate, hence more interior than even our acutest consciousness of the Divine presence, the nearest approach we can make to a description of man’s first response is to say that it is implicit. What is inmost immediately is made mediate or explicit by what we find ourselves doing. Consciousness, at its best, is a mediating activity: it proceeds by aid of imagery, ideas, emotions, and mental processes, in general, through changing inner states. Hence, doctrine is required to disclose the modes by which the Lord acts into and through the inmost into the interiors, thence into the mind at large, thus into the exteriors, including both the external mind and the brain. Divine influx attains its objectives in us by reaching even what is outermost, from degree to degree.
Spirit, as internal or inward man, is therefore what makes him truly man. From spirit, outward into the body, the reality of man’s nature is gradational; spirit, being mostly real, mental processes in general less so, and the body as “garment” or external covering least so, least enduring. Again, what pertains to spirit is most particular or significant; while that which is corporeal, is most general, subservient, existing for spirit, not in any sense for itself. Spirit actually “clothes itself with the body as a garment.” This is no mere figure of speech. The body has neither life nor meaning save from the fact that it is an instrument of the spirit.

Spirit as “in” the body as a whole in its several functions and organs, is present within its purer substances, in the motor and sensory organs, which serve the purposes of natural existence. Hence, we should never regard the spirit as a passenger in the body, but always with reference to ends which we attain by having experience of natural things, and fostering the life of affection. It is by utilizing its interiors that the spirit functions as “alive.” No such function is dependent on the so-called life of the body. The interiors of the spirit are affections and thoughts from love and wisdom. Man depends on these interiors with the spheres they carry in the spiritual world for whatever is substantial in his life, although he also grounds his existence in natural things, by training his hands to toil and his brain to become efficient. Through these interiors, man as spirit communicates with his fellowmen. Hence, as his interiors change, his relationships with his spiritual associates and their societies change also.

As the spirit is so intimately concerned with what is good and true, we note these relationships first, before considering external conduct and bodily behavior save so far as the preceding chapters have made us acquainted with the elements of such life in the outer world. The spirit is always such as our central love is in all these relationships. For this is the love through which we live and think when, for instance, we dedicate ourselves to the pursuit of truth,
however long and arduous, or to social service under baffling conditions. We are partly forming
the spirit by what we take to be ourselves in veriest reality. Spirit is substance-energy quickened
by both constantly renewed influx, and the responses of mind and heart. As will and
understanding constitute it, the spirit is formed from the deeds which will accomplishes, and the
detailed responses which thought makes. We are all the while making the spirit, therefore, even
when we regard ourselves as creatures of flesh and blood.

Since the life of man varies according to changing states, with affections arising from
these, for instance, an afternoon for children who are being educated under our care, spirit is
inclusive of all variations and responses. We may therefore think of spirit as pulsating through
these responsive states, even as heart and lungs have pulsation and respiration. It is this
intimate relation to states in process, with rhythms of activity, which makes the spirit
“organic,” a term which might be misleading if taken literally, forgetting that spirit is
substance-energy highly equipped with functions for spiritual living.

Spirit is not substance in the sense of remoteness from the viscera, organs, and members
of the fleshly body; spirit cleaves to these in close conjunction, even in the modes of motion of
every fiber. In this regard, spirit animates heart and lungs, with similar senses and like motions
throughout. But these are fleshly or natural correspondences. The spirit is never to be regarded as
merely a purer natural entity or being. To make such a statement would be to forget that man is
spiritual from Love and Wisdom. His spirit is more distinct from natural things than the light of
the brightest mood is distinct from the darkest shadows of late autumn. The natural man
inevitably regards external things as fixed and permanent, for he must adapt his behavior to
them. Hence, if the clue to spirit were taken from material things, man’s inner life would remain
unknown. Radically different is the approach when the inner life is regarded from the viewpoint of motives allying man’s life with degrees of truth and reality.

Spirit is primarily love. Thought even when most spiritual is thought therefrom, secondary to love. Hence, when a man is thinking “solely from his own spirit,” at home by himself, he is thinking from affections pertaining to his love.¹⁸³ It is this inwardness which gives the true contrast to thought embodied through brain and body in external action; hence, the fine distinction between “spirit” and “soul.” Spirit is truly internal man, while soul is interior rather than internal, when mutual love is not in it. The internal includes what is most profoundly the Lord’s in man, God’s “own,” in contrast with the lesser own-hood which involves self-centeredness.¹⁸⁴ Spirit is more immediately love for Divine good, while soul is the love of Divine truth.¹⁸⁵
Chapter 14

Spirit and Soul

Still pursuing the various meanings of these highly significant terms, spirit and soul, we note that spirit is will and understanding in the sense that *spirit functions as soul* in various connections; as higher intellect, for example, prior to its functioning in the lower mind (*animus*), with the subsequent perceptions which relate man to the natural world. Naturally, influx as Divine in origin, can neither be known nor even thought about until the nature of the spirit, with the inmost in which the Lord dwells, is first made known through doctrine. Nor are we prepared to consider the intercourse of soul with body unless we understand the nature and function of soul. That is to say, every function of the soul is first from Divine life, is first spiritual, before its activity becomes intelligible in relation, for example, to will and understanding. Given the central principle, we are prepared to follow the statement that the soul *lives within the body* without neglecting the true sources of life, always mindful of the truth that it is man as interior entity who acts through the body, the body being a lower degree. In one sense of the word, man always is spirit as an enduring entity, as if he did not progress or even change, since he is able to receive Love and Wisdom from eternal sources. But in another sense of the term, his spiritual life is intelligible through acknowledgment and progressive affections, as if, in spirit, he was dependent on what he accomplishes. Only by starting aright, noting the connection in which intimately allied terms are used, is it possible to avoid confusing words with almost interchangeable meanings, as we note the relevancy, now of “spirit,” and now of “soul,” passing
almost imperceptibly from either term to the “internal,” in general, or to the “internal man,” mindful of the contrast implied, as in turning from what is interior to what is exterior. Hidden activities become intelligible by thus beginning (in thought) with their sources, noting, for example, that although the soul functions in, or as mind, it is never soul from sense-impulses, from the brain, as if created by bodily parents as a by-product of physical forces only; and yet, in another connection, soul has a meaning in creative relationships which are clarified in their rightful connection.

Spirit is, overall, the higher term, albeit “soul” is sometimes synonymous even with the inmost, with the internal man in his fullness, thus with man himself, or as will and understanding, when these terms stand for his complete nature in relation to the Divine. In general, spirit already is the man who lives after death; hence, man is already in the spiritual world. But, in a different connection, spirit is “organic” when regarded as joined to the body, and as possessing spiritual senses corresponding to the bodily ones, so that rebirth in the flesh is not essential to his salvation. But, still remembering the special meanings here implied, we observe how serviceable the term “soul” when man’s nature is referred to, as from the father, that is, his beginning in the ovum. Again, in another connection, soul and body are said to be “one,” when it is a question of certain relationships only. The soul, in these specific instances, is the “inmost life” of every man from the father, while the external principle (thus understood) is from the mother. The term inmost is thus relative to a certain extent, mediately so; while spirit as possessing an inmost from the Divine receives an immediate influx.

Despite the fact that soul is a higher degree than body, soul and body make “a one,” not through identity of substance, and surely not by neglect of correspondences; but because soul here stands for “use,” body for exercise or expression. Yet, approached in a radically different
way, soul and body are so distinct that the one fights with the other, as in temptation, when lower impulses seek to become dominant. The soul is man’s “veriest singulars” when man is not acting in the details of concrete life. Soul is the life of both internal and external man. But when body is the external under consideration, the soul is internal, since the soul is where man lives with his “very life” in contrast with his body.

Additional meanings come into view when it becomes a question of true or spiritual love in contrast with physical passion, thus, of marital love as heavenly in origin, in sharp antithesis with a long series of bodily conditions intimately related to their mental associates. The doctrine does full justice to all that is lowliest in origin in human nature, while always equally distinctive in characterizing the soul, as far from being primarily conditioned by the body. Inmost principles, such as goods and truths, have their inner meanings, in contrast with apparent virtues of earthly origin. Always in case of doubt, when reality is compared with appearances, the soul is the real man through which life inflows. The term reality invariably means something other than a merely “cogitative something, ethereal in essence,” as if the soul could exist without senses and motive organs; hence, the reason for employing terms which seem almost to identify it with the brain and senses. But always there enters in the qualification, that soul acts into “purer” forms, motivating these from the spirit. These purer forms pertain to the spiritual body, which endures even while the body is declining. It would be a fallacy to suggest that the soul might dissipate with the body.

It would also be a fallacy to hold that the soul resides either in the heart, the brain, or in some portion of it, as if it could thence rule the body by organic pressure, mechanical in nature. Soul is, of course, in both the head and the body. But “mind” is the appropriate term here. Man, as soul, acts through mind, thus through body, in the natural world according to the mental
elements which we have been considering. His actions are not to be identified with the “deeds” 
(karma) which, in a radically different teaching, are said to be what survive bodily death in each 
incarnation. His acts are intelligible in the light of their motivations, as his motives are described 
in terms of inner states, thus in the light of their correspondences. So, the “soul or spirit” is much 
more substantial than an alleged personality which needs rebirth. It is much more than its deeds. 
It is intelligible in terms of its quality, thus by reference to a spiritual body which is to be of far 
greater significance than a new fleshly body would express. Mere deeds would have no internal 
coherence. If its substances were of bodily origin, these could fall away.

So, we remember anew that a spirit has no bodily extension. Therefore, the form by 
which we truly envisage it, is not primarily that of the body. This statement holds true despite the 
fact that spirit is “organic” in its relatedness, and that will, and understanding are in the brain in 
“first principles.” Starting aright, our thought begins, instead, with the truth of the Divine image 
and likeness from which naught can be taken away, to which nothing can be added by way of 
perfecting the human form. For man is a habitation of Love and Wisdom, intelligible as 
“perpetual endeavors” with him to achieve heavenly ends through union of goods and truths. 
This indwelling is by influx, in which there is no mingling of Divine substance with soul, hence, 
no identifications of soul with body. More specifically, it is influx into soul and, thence, into the 
rational mind of the higher type. It would be a perversion of rationality to confuse soul with God, 
identifying proximity or contiguity with continuity, as if man and God were mystically one. Nor 
does the soul mystically interfuse itself into the body. It proceeds by way of the rational mind 
into the purer substances, as already indicated. This is the reason for tracing influx stage by
stage, defining spirit before mind, even though we begin by describing mental life without having first defined it.††

Since soul is not life but a recipient of Divine life, this cardinal distinction is foremost all along the descriptive line. The recipient substance, for example, has nothing in common with substances or changes in the natural world. As the descent of Divine life is from highest to lowest, inmost to outmost by degrees; so, in man, the descent is from soul as internal, through spiritual mind and natural mind to body. This “proceeding forth” is “one in essence,” by correspondence only, not by sheer outflow without gradations. For example, the soul as life of the minds is more immediately such in will, than in the derivative thoughts of the understanding.

Again, the spirit more immediately imbues the interiors, as its spiritual mind, than the exteriors as its natural mind. The quality of man’s soul is directly inherent, by virtue of its higher origin, less directly so as dependent on man’s mode of response to Divine influx. For a man “induces” a quality on his soul by his conduct.196 He also induces a form on his interiors, on their purest substances; hence, the truth in the statement that “a man forms his own soul.”

The value of the soul meanwhile consists in man’s activities in both worlds. Hence, his intellectual life enters into the account, also his volitions. The life of faith, life from faith is a factor; hence, will as expressing faith. What is essential to know is that the soul, by its central love, disposes the interiors to attain these, its ends. Since the soul so readily takes on forms which love gives to will, and will to understanding, we need to guard against the possibility that love of self may be the actuating motive, where it might have been love for the Lord and charity

†† Dresser’s explanation is remarkably like the American theologian Henry James, Sr. (1811-1882), father of the psychologist and philosopher William James (1842-1910) and novelist (Henry James Jr. (1843-1916). A complex Swedenborgian, who seethed with opinions on the singular awareness of God and eternity, James hungered for holiness. He was a perfectionist with millennial expectations impelled by a vision of the ideal. The centerpiece of his thinking was his intense conception of God as creator. He believed in the moral equality of man and the fellowship of “community” that outweighed all other demands of life.
toward the neighbor. Much depends, therefore, on attributing real efficiency of spirit or soul to Love and Wisdom.\textsuperscript{197}

Despite any limitations due to dependence on subject-matter deriving its imagery from the natural world, man is more securely spiritual in his thought than in his pleasures, or in anything fleshly related to self-love.\textsuperscript{198} The spirit “sensates” both spiritually and naturally. As sensating it is always prior to the body, whatever the order \textit{in time} of a man’s sense-experiences. As sensating by aid of will springing from interior love, its activity is substantial. The will as substance is endowed with efficiency. Hence, man possesses \textit{real} substance.\textsuperscript{199} Indeed, we are now prepared for the brief statement that “the spirit of man is his purer substance annexed to the things of his body.”\textsuperscript{200} The beginnings of both spiritual and natural substances in their relations of proximity are in the brain, namely, the beginnings which make practical action possible.\textsuperscript{201} Such a beginning is implied in a deed of manifold usefulness for a person in distress. The one who acts as the Good Samaritan, must try to set activities in motion in that direction. Granted the impetus of love from the interiors of the spirit, the mental effort ensues. Given this effort ("endeavor"), the bodily motions follow. The mental effort would be impossible without the series of spiritual activities leading up to and terminating in it. The results of physical motions would be impossible without the mental effort.

Restating the process with reference to the substances implied, we observe that spiritual substances pertain to the spirit or soul; and, by such substance is also meant the formative activity which manifests love and wisdom, life and power, as well as the guiding principle which makes the activity effective in a definite way. Substance, in this sense of the term, is substance or form as the degree which does not depend on any nutriment from nature. In the mind, however, there are both spiritual and natural substances. Thought is from the former, lesser mental
activities from the latter. In the body, there are natural substances only, those which come and go with the process of birth, nutrition, and decay.

It is difficult to disengage our thought from the imagery of the bodily organism, that we may consider the inmost of the spirit by itself. Even the poetic terms which we readily employ, such as “heart,” readily suggest bodily organs alone. We have no direct experience on which to draw, since the inmost is where the Lord dwells with man, to guide, to rule, and protect him in such a way that he receives life and responds but does not even know himself as receiving and reacting. Hence, the inmost can be known only through instruction. Fortunately, some of the most characteristic passages in the Bible have given us poetic imagery concerning the holy of holies, where the Lord is most truly with man.

In very truth, thought from spiritual perception is the inmost in its finest intellectual response. Our highest thought is intuitive just because it is from the inmost; not from processes of analysis, judgment, inference, or reasoning based on facts apprehended through bodily senses, or even from conclusions previously accepted in the ordinary way. Our most interior thought does not become analytical until it has already passed from the inmost to the understanding; it is only when our thought is analytical, that we may describe it as “conscious” thought, as involving reasonings which we can reduce to propositions.

The same is true of the highest type of love, which unites the spirit with the Lord, also uniting man with man as mutual love, and marital love in purest form.²⁰² But who can describe the conjunction of heart with heart? What we portray poetically, in narratives of the ideal life, in our counsels to one another, is the resulting experience and thought, not the essential reality itself. So, too, the Divine goodness, prompting our spirit to nobleness of life, conjoining with Divine truth, has its basis in the inmost.²⁰³ But we are not conscious of goods apart from truths,
or of their conjunction, or root. What we know is the deed which we discover mind and body doing as a “one,” because the heart has been touched to do the deed of kindly service. The nature of our spiritual experience is such that the inmost internals and externals of our selfhood act as one. The Divine life inflows from the highest level of its activity into the inmost of men, thence, into the interiors, and so to the exteriors. What is presupposed is always the inmost in the highest thought, and love, the purest prompting due to Divine goods and truths.

The inmost, in brief, is that region (if the term be permissible) of the spirit which can receive and appropriate Divine life. It is the state or condition nearest perfection, near enough in very truth to receive direct influx from the Divine, in the modes above indicated. Hence, on the human side, there is an inmost in relation to goods as well as to perceptive thought. This is what is meant by inmost in the plural. From the inmost come what is spiritually essential in each phase of our inward life. Thus, there is the inmost in the highest activity of the will. The inmost, as a possibility of response to Divine love, is with us even though we make no response. It is with us as the source and basis of our life.

We envisage the inmost, then, as the first in the series of states and conditions which make possible our whole being; first and inmost, then the interiors under it, on the plane next in order, and then the exteriors, below the interiors. Each plane, with its status and principles, is to be distinguished from the others: first, second, and third, in a descending series. The influx follows the same order. What is essential to the second, is from the first, and what is essential to the third (outermost in the visible body of flesh and blood), is the inmost which inflows and holds its center. This shows why and how the inmost and the interiors can be “together” in the exteriors, how Divine goods and truths can be made manifest in bodily deeds.
The various meanings given to the inmost depend, therefore, on the plane, or state under consideration. The spirit is inmost in relation to man in general. But if we are speaking of man’s life with respect to the element due to the father, then the soul is the inmost in comparison with the body. The inmost in a man who responds in love to the Lord, and the neighbor, is of a different state in comparison with the inmost in one whose ruling love is for self and the world. When it is a question of our relationship to the spiritual world, in our interiors we may be with men in heaven; but it is with our inmost that we are nearest the Lord. The inmost is what is immediate in our relationship with the Divine, while our interiors are mediate. Hence, we may define the inmost as the immediacy of the human spirit, if we bear the foregoing descriptions in mind. There is no door to be opened before the Lord can enter. There is no transmitting medium, not even a mediating principle like the purest glass, or the finest ethers of space. The Lord is always “here.” No bar could keep Him from entering. No wall hides his presence even when He is denied.

Given this realization concerning what we may call, by excess of language, the holiest of inmost, we see that the same principle is inwrought in the whole structure of the spirit, which in turn is immediate in all its activities. It is the inmost element of thought, for example, which conveys what is universal, making the universe intelligible, as a system of law and order. So, too, it is what is universal as inmost which makes it possible for us to will and love. In this sense will is the inmost of our whole nature; for will is formed from love, and what man loves inmost, he wills; hence, will characterizes his whole central life. From the inmost, in this sense, proceed all man’s affections and the thoughts which spring from these. The inmost is the end which he pursues. The mental cause is found in the various states and details which make up the
attendant mental life. Hence, we are really studying the inmost when analyzing both will and understanding.\textsuperscript{212}

Recognition of the sequence, then, is important, so that whether we think first of externals, then of internals, we come next to what is inmost; or, if we think first of inmost, then of internals, and thence to externals, implying internals, we are concerned with the same principle. The relationships in question, in either order, are disposed and ordinate, both simultaneously and successively, for the reception of life through all eternity.\textsuperscript{213} Therefore we are considering the Divine order of man’s spiritual nature and life, a structure such that neither time nor space intervenes. A man who is open interiorly toward heaven can be in his inmost and in a more perfect state than in the slower processes of his understanding. Again, in his bodily deeds, his conduct may lag far behind what he understands. Each plane is distinctive. The sole direct clue throughout is correspondence, in terms of which we are able intelligently to describe states and conditions which at first seemed far apart.\textsuperscript{214}

It has sometimes been assumed that God resides in our hearts only. The present doctrine is that the Divine sphere, proceeding from the inmost into the universe, so proceeds that the inmost is in everything that comes in succession. Had we the eyes, we could read the inmost in the outermost structure of the world. So, man’s external form is a domicile of the highest, which truly shows what is real in the structure called the body. Very important, then, is the doctrine which shows why the inmost is provided, and how it is disposed in relation to man’s total selfhood and the bodily organism, so that we may always bear in mind what is divinely immediate in us. We may then endeavor to adjust ourselves in thought and will so that our minds shall be actuated by what is inmosty related to Divine influx. Thus, we may at least appreciatively realize from what relation the Lord acts in us, although not directly aware of his
action. We know that, such as the inmost, so the whole in its ideal trend or potentiality. Thus we may envisage the law of spiritual progression, supplementing experience according to the principles which the doctrine supplies.\textsuperscript{215}
Chapter 15
Will

The preceding chapter made clear the truth that the inmost is implied in all sequences so that it can be present in fullness in the outermost. But we have learned that the term “internal” is, in a certain respect, more restricted. Spirit or soul, as the internal man, is in contrast with the body as external. The spirit, as internal, is the real man who lives in the spiritual world and survives bodily death. The external man is natural, and lives in the outer world. Thought and will are internal, in contrast with speech and action, as their external representatives. By the internal way, man has communication with heaven. Externally, he receives the light of the world. From the internal comes all spiritual perception. The internal feels through the external and flows into it. The internal not only distinguishes man from the brute but is characteristic of man in relation to the Lord. The inmost implies “internals” or “forms” which, in detail, enable man to receive from the Divine influx and to be united with the Lord. The inmost cannot, we have seen, be divided. Hence, we may not say, “Here the Lord ceases and man begins.” For the inmost is really the Lord with man. But concerning the internal, we may rightly say, “This is not the Lord.” For the internal is not life, but a recipient of Life.

The inmost abounds in ineffable possibilities. But nothing becomes internal, as above described, until implanted in the will. The voluntary and intellectual life of man, in general, is from the internal. More specifically, will and understanding are at once internal and external, since both are regarded from two points of view, according to the nature of the promptings which
actuate them. As the external man is to be understood as “formed to the image of the world,” that this form may receive the things of the world\textsuperscript{220}, so the internal, “formed to the image of heaven,” to receive its life, is expressed in will and understanding in the internal way in this higher connection. The internal is secondary as “that from which something comes forth.”\textsuperscript{221} As the efficient cause, or moving force, it is always to be regarded with reference to this “something else.” Thus, the internal principle of action is always the will. But as will may respond to two types of love, it is well to bear in mind the long series of contrasts between internal and external.

The internal of man’s life, for example, constitutes his heaven; good is more internal than its manifestations; and man’s internals are in process of being opened, as he advances from infancy to manhood, in keeping with his openness to goods and truths. Only from the spiritually internal does man think and will wisely; all the interiors of man’s life center, indeed, about the internal principles, which are also clues to man’s correspondence with the angelic heavens. A man’s external form might be beautiful, his internal ugly. Precepts concerning spiritual living are truly kept, when kept in their internal form, the internal being the test of character. Again, it is the internal which presents, while the external represents. Belief is internal, behavior external. Internals are in externals, to be sure, but there may not be complete correspondence. Hence, everything turns upon man’s real quality, the internal being always the test of what is genuine. The process of conjunction with goods and truths is never from external to internal, as if, perchance, man could attain real goodness by outward conformity: the conjunction is of the internal with the external.\textsuperscript{222} Good is the great conjoining power. The external is the test only in the sense that, as good is from the Lord, it inflows from internal to external. The measure of expression of goods in outward forms will then affect further influx into the internal. Influx depends, in part, on efflux; whatever impedes expression, has its effect on the internal process of
reception. The external is often gross and material, in contrast with the internal, as pure and spiritual. So, it may be greatly in need of spiritual quickening. A man may be so enveloped by externals as to be in labor and combat. But a man may so dwell in internals that his conflicts shall cease.

These contrasts well in hand, we revert for the moment to the teaching made clear by considering the nature of spirit, namely, that will rather than understanding is the explanatory principle, notably because of the identity of will with love, and the central truth that Love descends to man through degrees, to spirit, in which Love becomes appreciable as love and will. We also remember that Life, as influx, is the efficiency. Our inquiry now gradually turns from the internal at large, to a study of the most significant faculty or organ of the spirit. We shall first consider this power in the guise of will, because this is the more familiar mental term. The other term, love, is, in fact, usually omitted from psychology save in connection with studies of the emotions. To literature, in general, is left opportunities for describing love in the wealth of its manifold history. It is characteristic of our doctrine to insist that will and love are inseparable.

We begin the present analysis of will by distinguishing the term, as here used, from scientific and popular views with which it might be confused. These views, since the days of widespread acceptance of the theory of evolution, have been concerned with an effort to explain will by its natural history. This development has been said to proceed from the action of the forces of man’s environment on his organism. Within the organism itself, mental development has supposedly advanced from simple to complex, from lower to higher forms, as in the natural world in general. In mental life, the simplest item, or element, is sensation, leading to sense-perception in relation to reflexes, stimuli, and the native responses usually classed under instinct; which, in turn, is related to desire, emotion, pleasure and pain, and so on up the scale. Will, as a
much more highly developed product, seems due to the simplest responses which went before: it is a selective activity associated with our primitive strivings or urges, not a separate faculty at all.

Another description of the will agrees to a large extent with the foregoing but emphasizes the fact that it appears in connection with attention. Whatever engages and holds attention, is likely to influence conduct. Behind attention, with its fixation on various interests, is will, affected from moment to moment, by objects of attention, many of which force themselves on our notice. Attention is first involuntary, derived from experience, which pursues its own course; then voluntary, in so far, for example, as we select our interests and press them through to realization by successive acts of attention which keep the subject before us. Plainly, thought enters all of our interests. Hence, intellect and will are almost inseparable. Less defensible than this view is the popular idea of will as “power” exerted on occasion or restrained on other occasions. Thus, we hear people complaining of lack of “will-power.”

The objection to descriptions of will as derived by evolution from sense-experience, or from attention and its forerunners, is that the attempted explanation is from the outside to the inner world. This theory proceeds on the assumption that will is a product of simpler, or earlier mental elements. The description stops far short of the chief consideration. It fails because the higher phases or elements of mental life cannot even be described from the lower point of view, to say nothing of explanation with reference to causes, and the interpretation of will in the light of spiritual principles, and the effect of will on understanding. The objection to the popular view of “will-power” is that it uncritically attributes power to will, hence to man, on the supposition that this power is independently inherent in man. But man has no such power, not even to do good, or to continue to do good when helped by others to make a beginning. Will is undoubtedly akin to mental elements manifesting themselves earlier in man’s experience. It is allied with both
interest and attention, also with what has been called the “sense of effort.” But, far more significantly, it implies character and the affections, thus the man who selects or wills because he loves; hence, the need for a much profounder conception.

Presupposed in even the simplest description of will, is the existence of the human spirit, with its inmost where resides the Divine presence, where Divine influx comes imperceptibly to man. This influent Life imbues the will as a recipient form adapted for responses and assimilation. The term “form” is not then a synonym for the term “faculty,” as popularly used. The crude word “receptacle” gives only the barest notion of what this recipiency of Divine influx means. Such a word easily suggests passivity, whereas, a great deal depends on the activity wherewith man responds.

Although, in some sense, a faculty and a receptacle, will in the greater sense is from love by influx; influx is dynamic, and love as vivifying activity, is to be envisaged with reference to every process that motivates mind and body through the affections and functions of will and thought. Man not only receives life through this instrument of love, but the life of the external, in the remotest degree, is from the same source. As the heart pulsates to maintain the functions of the bodily organs, so the life from within-outward pulsates as incessantly as a stream proceeds on its course. The will, as giving the first recipient form to the influent life prior to the form contributed by the understanding, is an energizing activity, not a static mold in which fluid is crystallized. Even though man responds for the worse, he responds; he does something. In whatever he does, both will and love are implied.

Man’s spirit would be merely general without will as its form. Hence, will pertains to the whole series of responses in the inner life, natural, spiritual and celestial; and is potentially in man from birth.\footnote{223} Willing (volition) is, in fact, man himself from whence comes his nature and
disposition, with the important qualification that “man” includes understanding also. Love, as inclusive of will, is the life of man not only in the sense that the whole body falls within its sphere, but whatever touches his love affects mind and body, love as “life” being most central, most influential.

Apparently, thought constitutes the whole man. This is because thought is evident while love is hidden. Love produces affections from within itself, also intentions, and these products man does indeed know. So, too, will discloses its presence by what it does Thus, it may gradually be known by experience and observation. Man’s will as recipient of love, and regarded as substantial, is a “perpetual endeavor to act.” Hence, “to love is to do, because it is to will,” and whatever a man loves, he wills. The will, as recipient, is not in any sense an abstract spiritual entity, but is concrete through its substances. It is specific, because the purpose of its being is to assimilate and manifest Love and Wisdom, also because it includes man’s nature as a thinking subject or self.

Furthermore, will is concrete and all perceiving, thinking, and knowing, as well as in the other activities of mental life. It is central in relation to the inmost and the interiors, to the internal or “real” man, in contrast with derivative affections and thoughts which express, in part, only what man is. The fundamental means of will are also implied in questions pertaining to freedom, rationality, and responsibility, reserved for later discussion. For the time being, we note the fact that will, although most intimate in its relation to understanding, is also “perfectly distinct,” as appertaining to good, while understanding is allied with truth. Unless this discrimination were made, there would be confusion between what is outermost in man’s life, in corporeal and sensuous forms, and what is inmost wherein the will toward good, allied with understanding of truth, is to be distinguished from desires and matters of mere memory. There is
a successive order from inmost to interior, and interior to exterior, which makes the whole series of relationships intelligible. The love that makes man’s inmost life, is love-and-will toward good, love being the efficient cause; while his life, in relation to truth, acquires quality from the understanding.

Will is central, in contrast with thought which follows from it as the “first effect” of love as a cause. In contrast with perceiving by aid of the senses, will is more internal than thought. For sense-perception is a “second effect,” with outward behavior following. We will to realize a purpose, because we love the end implied. We reflect upon this end and consider how to attain it. We adapt our proposed line of action to the world of external things, as sense-perception has taught us to know it. Finally, we make our intention objective by putting our conduct into effect through bodily behavior, as the Good Samaritan succored the man fallen by the wayside, instead of merely perceiving without lifting a finger or uttering a word. It is essential to know the true order from love to life, love to the first effect, and to the second one, continuing through to external fulfillment.

Man is dependent on love and wisdom through the fact that these are one in their causality, although distinguishable through the way man receives them. All power to will is from Love, as thus flowing into the spirit. Man’s ability to love, and thence to will as if from himself, is to be understood as nearly as possible apart from his ability to assimilate Wisdom. Man’s freedom in spiritual things, resides in his will as prior to understanding. Here is the source of the human side of the good, which imbues the will, but which also thinks from truth, although the truth is so rich in meanings that we may well consider it as much by itself as we can.

What is dominant in man’s conduct, is of the will through its ruling love. The understanding by comparison is secondary, because it contributes the forms, not merely
responding to truth, but by supplying the intellectual details and means. In this sense, will “does nothing by itself apart from understanding.” The union of the two by influx is essential to complete self-expression. The will searches the understanding for the means and modes of attaining its ends in the deeds which make man’s purposes effective. The richly varied diversity of the motives come from the will. Eventually, the subsequent works belong to the will, also, to the body (through the concrete deeds), but only formally to the understanding. Man’s will also the more directly contains the Lord’s purpose for man the individual. Hence, will is directly recipient of that “life of charity” in which all efficient goods consist.

Again, as “every man is his own love,” and tends to regard all goods and truths as his, the will is individual in each man: each can will, think, and act freely, as if from himself. Knowledge of this twofold relationship of love (from the Lord and as taken unto oneself) underlies the truth that the will is the entire man. There is life in man to the degree that he receives both Love and Wisdom. His life is “nothing else,” save from these two. But it is useful to know that the changes of state are due immediately to will, while the variations of form are due to the thoughts. Will cannot act at all, save through the understanding. Thus acting, will is in a measure curbed. But in another sense meaning, is will unfolded, or made explicit. One of its reasons for existing is that it may disclose the will’s quality. It is the relation to good more than to truth, which makes man’s essential nature known. Nothing, in fact, becomes internal until implanted in the will. What a man loves above all things, is so implied in his will, that it is a hidden current running through his whole being.

Man’s “veriest will” formed from his love, is to be distinguished from all appearances. Whatever a man loves, he so surely wills—what he loves, being dominant in his scale of things worthwhile—that no line should be drawn between the two, as if a man first loved, and then
exerted his will by some hidden “power” (as in the popular view) to adopt what he loves. But we may, indeed, discriminate between (1) will in the internal voluntary sense, where intelligence resides most interiorly; and (2) will in the external voluntary sense, where intelligence is external.\textsuperscript{232} Loving and willing are one of those beatific insights in which to see, is to love. Our volitions are very different when our interest shifts toward external matters in which we utilize memory-images, and much more slowly make our way toward conclusions. We note also that evil deeds come forth from will with little dependence on understanding.

We observe further, to make the distinction perfectly clear, will take two directions: (1) outward toward the world, and (2) inward toward heaven.\textsuperscript{233} These modes carry two determinations of the understanding. A man might will and think wholly from facts of sense-experience acquired by contact with the world and actuated by the stimuli of his bodily senses and appetites. But a man might be above the sensuous, withdrawn from it, and then he would think interiorly. The sensuous would then become quiescent and, when turning toward heavenly things, man’s thought would be actuated by influx from Divine good into the will. With spiritual and celestial men, this higher determination would be habitual, with mere alternations of interest in external things. In the process of regeneration, this relationship is brought to the fore. Man “lives in his spirit,” more especially when his will is thus determined. The significance of will is also seen in the fact that regeneration is not forced on man, but that he may “suffer himself” to be regenerated, by turning from outward to inward things. Good and truth, in order to belong to man, must be in-rooted in his will.\textsuperscript{234} The determination toward heaven may be appropriately termed the higher will. This is also the “new” will, the “old” one, being his native tendency to look toward self and the natural world, actuated by inferior affections.
The inmost with man is always, in a sense, will and understanding, even when will is directed toward the external world. The will of man is always such as the goods he adopts make it. In the opposite sense, will is such as evil makes it.

A man may think truth from the understanding without thinking it from the will, without willing and doing what he thinks. When a man wills truth, and from willing does it, then the truth is assuredly in both understanding and will. Thus, we realize afresh that the spirit is formed from will, the will which makes good and truth veritably our own. The ideal is a life according to truth in the understanding from the will, and a life according to genuine good in the will, by mediation of the understanding. The whole sensitive and active life may thereby be elevated. Since the soul of the will is love, the will must be in either evil or good; it cannot be in both, as this would rend man himself asunder. Hence, Divine influx continually flows into man’s will to give power to shun evils as sins, that a man rises into his true integrity.

Granted that recipiency on the part of the will from the Divine is measured by love to the neighbor and the Lord, and that the likeness of God pertains to Love, while the image pertains to Wisdom, we are prepared for the statement that there is reciprocal union between these two, so that the wisdom in man is such as the love is, while the love is such as the wisdom. This reciprocity is in essence and life, substance and form. Man is a recipient by contiguity with regard to the forms that receive, implying nearness and capacity for conjunction, but allowing for choice, hence, for assent or rejection, according to the individual. The spiritual mind, and with it, the higher will, is not open from birth, but is capable of being opened. Union of the will with the Lord is therefore an objective to be striven for, as indeed spiritual freedom is an end to be attained.
Man’s two capacities may be closed by misuse so that, by virtue of his rational abilities, a man can think whatever he pleases, either with the Lord or against Him. Man is also able to will and to do what he likes. Thus, in effect, he may act contrary to what would reasonably be his will if he did not pervert the lower phase of his understanding. In the spiritual world, no one is able to do anything contrary to his will, for his interior is transparent. The Holy Spirit is indeed resident in every man but is “variously veiled by each.” This is a truth for each man to learn. In their natural guise, will and understanding tend to be like the natural world. Hence, man first, tends to love this world. But will and understanding, spiritually regarded, tend to be like the spiritual world, when that world is loved. The natural readily reacts against the spiritual until man is enlightened and learns that there is Divine influx. It is equally easy to confuse what is Divine with what is natural, through ignorance of the degrees which distinguish man from the Lord. Man has no being-in-himself; his being is from the Lord. He has no love or wisdom in pure essence, for the Lord is Love and Wisdom as such. But he has the Divine likeness and the Divine image so individuated in him, that each of us is a different self (containant), receiving and manifesting the Divine according to individuality. Hence, as a true individual, each has a complete corrective of the misapprehensions into which we sometimes fall.

Furthermore, as will is spirit in action, as it rules the body, there is opportunity to learn what it is by study of the organism which obeys it. Physiologically, as we have noted, the will is localized in the right side of the brain, while the understanding is on the left, as the channel of volition. More specifically, the cerebellum is its organ. Every particular of thought and will is inscribed on the brain, and so all particulars are made concrete in the organism as a whole. Hence, the will is literally in the body in its entirety, and it actuates the whole body. Indeed, the body behaves from an affection of the will. As life turns its receptacles, so the whole man turns,
the decisive determination being the ruling love. Will and understanding unite to form the “living endeavor,” which implies the efficiency. Through this vitalizing force, all action is produced in the organism.

The chief considerations are not the relationships of will to lesser elements and its rule over the body; but the fact that will is identified with love, which takes either a worldly direction, or a heavenly one, and that the will may be in disunion with understanding. Hence, the attainment of union between will and understanding may be regarded as man’s greatest need. Only when the understanding is ruled by the will, do the two constitute one mind, one life, so that to will is forthwith to do.

Will is not derived from evil desires, but evil desires reign when man is corrupt. So, too, insane fantasies may corrupt the understanding, hence, interfere with will. Man should guard against the notion that everything he thinks is originally of the understanding, or that everything he desires is of the will. For understanding from Divine truth, and will from Divine good, also figure in the inner life, although man may not be aware that these activities are from his inmost selfhood. He should also know that, when evil desires reign, it may well be that understanding must be reformed before will. To do that which is good, is not from man’s own will, but from a new will due to Divine good. Conscience is also a factor in this process. We note especially that will is central. The question of power in connection with will turns upon the deeper question of the love that prevails. Hence, we know where to concentrate our efforts. What a man thoroughly believes and loves, is perpetually in his will. If he realizes what it is that he loves above everything else, he need not pay so much attention to other phases of the life of will. Yet, it is always important to remember that will is concrete (definite): “to will apart from knowing, perceiving, and thinking what one wills, is not anything.” Will always involves love for
something specific, such as love for teaching school, love of leadership in civic matters. Love also has relation to good, for example, one’s specific service to the community in fulfilling civic functions. Hence, the circle from love to thoughts, from thoughts to love, is the concrete circle of love. Otherwise stated, the Lord flows into the life’s love of everyone, and through its affections into perceptions and thoughts, will being the decisive element on the human side.
Chapter 16
Mental Origins

It was once customary to explain many of our simpler processes by appeal to instinct as their general source. By instinct was meant a group of tendencies which were inborn, urges or drives which we did not acquire by experience. Later, came habit, acquired by the individual based on his instincts; desire, as a conscious urge, with its attendant strivings; and will, as the fruition of those tendencies and impulses, native and acquired. Hence, the instincts were classified with reference to their related emotions, as in case of flight-fear. The effort was to explain as many higher mental processes as possible by instinct. Thus, it became more plausible that mind is a product of inorganic evolution.

Again, it was customary to praise instinct in animals, such as the bee-line or homing instinct. For the more we learned about instinct in animals as “wonderful,” the more were we inclined to measure even human accomplishments by this standard. Although our own instincts were dull by comparison, we readily inferred that instinct is fundamental to bodily behavior, which, in turn, seemed to be the source of consciousness. It seemed probable that even our inner life had been acquired through our long ancestry in the external world.

Instinct loses its prominence with the explanation that it is due to influx from the spiritual world;\textsuperscript{245} for influx underlies all reflexes, native impulses, or primitive urges, and is, therefore, prior in origin to all activities formerly attributed to self-operative evolution. This does not mean that the signs of intelligence and skill in animals are minimized. These evidences are differently
interpreted, on the ground that there is a resourceful love resident in brute animals as well as in
man; from this love come the various promptings to action which makes possible later or more
complex modes of behavior.

There is love in every beast, bird, fish, reptile, and insect; a natural, or corporeal love,
which resides in the simple brain, which, in its turn, is a recipient of life to which instinct is due.
Influx expresses itself through what we call instinct because the recipient life functions without
the mediation of thought. Thus, an animal knows from influx its necessities.246 Birds know how
to build nests, lay eggs, hatch their young, and select appropriate food. The dog, from an “innate
genius,” knows how to act as faithful guardian, as if acting from his own nature.247 From the
expression of his master’s affection, the dog knows as if it were his master’s will; and, by
perceiving the scent of his footsteps and clothes, can follow him. The dog knows how, in novel
surroundings, to find his way home, even through trackless regions in dense forests. It would be
easy to infer from these signs of mental activity, that the dog has intelligence, even wisdom from
himself; for the one who takes this inference would as naturally attribute his own knowledge and
intelligence or wisdom entirely to himself. But spiritual perception discloses the fact that the
wisdom expressed through both dogs and men is due to heavenly influx. Marvelous evidences of
intelligence are, indeed, discoverable in the case of bees, for example, with their modes of living
under what may be called a form of government. When we realize that the intelligence is due to
influx, we have no reason for emphasizing instinct as if it operated by so mysterious power of
nature, acquired by contact with a material environment. At the same time, we may allocate
instinct to its proper place in the scale.

The place given to habit was also unduly prominent, so long as brain-habits were
supposed to underlie memory and all processes dependent on it. The teaching that man has two
memories means that the external memory is subordinate, hence, that cerebral habits occupy a secondary place, as no longer explanatory. New estimates follow all along the line. Will, for example, is not due to associations founded on brain-habits. We are not “creatures” of habit in matters of belief because repetition of bodily processes has made us conservative. Instead, our beliefs assume crystallized forms because we become confirmed in established modes of affection which, in turn, are due to our ruling love. When a given idea is intensified by dwelling on it with interest and affection, it forms an association, hence, a habit or “confirmation.” This process works both ways. A man can confirm himself in what is false by bringing to bear manifold ideas in line with this falsity, until it seems as convincing as truth itself. But he can also confirm the mind in what is true by appropriating ideas which make secure the rationality of his convictions and increase love for these. The basis of confirming as a mental process is habit as the law of routine. But, in our doctrine, habit is never explained on mechanical grounds, as if association were more potent than love. Whatever man confirms himself in, so that his incentives and ideas become matters of habit, is intimately related to affections: through will and understanding his attitudes find outward expression.248

Habit has its accessories in instinct.249 No fact is neglected by this change in explanatory principles. The life which functions through instinct is presupposed as intimately affiliated with habit. But all such activities are secondary. What really concerns us is to note how, when we adopt a negative attitude with regard to some doctrine which we have held in doubt, this negative attitude readily becomes part of our mental makeup so that we unwittingly act according to this attitude, condemning unheard principles which might have influenced us had we not become thus confirmed in attitude and belief. When a favoring or affirmative attitude reigns, we find that the result is satisfactory. In any event our “habits of thought” are expression of this tendency to
confirm affections and ideas so that they regularly function, a tendency due to the love which influences us when we confirm, either negatively or affirmatively.

Understanding why man is veritably a “creature” of habits, we may take the physiological (cerebral) basis for granted, then move forward to will and understanding, as powers to be more wisely used if we would establish habits favorable to spiritual living. Habit becomes a vital matter when we realize that a prevailing love may survive even bodily death as the habit which is to condition our future. But we also note that habit thus persists because it is part of us, not that it is merely an affair of the brain and the exterior memory; hence, we know where to begin to reform. Habit is, in brief, centrally due to affections which prevail long enough to become established in mind, so that these affections, while they endure, are equivalent to “second nature.”

We remind ourselves anew, therefore, that the bodily organism, especially the brain, is an instrument through which spirit functions. The body does not decide what modes of behavior shall prevail, even though there are many functions in operation through involuntary processes, as if the body dictated to us when the eyelashes should wink, when the cheek should take on a blush, or when we should register fright. The efficiency is none the less from the same source—the influx which operates through the bodily instincts. Hence, the process over which we exercise no direct control is not acquired by merely doing the thing over and over in a mechanical way. The body is developed in the direction in which it is regularly exercised, and operations not attributable to instinct, are due to activity from within through which all our higher faculties function, affected by the prevailing love. Thus, one can become a habitual drunkard, or a confirmed gambler, as well as an habitual devotee of ideals of social service; for the body is “mere obedience.” The alleged “mechanism,” in either case, is due to the dominant
function. A man becomes a “slave to habit,” as we say of those persons who must have precisely what they are accustomed to in exactly the same way, their food prepared in a certain way at a fixed time, or some other means of physical gratification, or be “utterly miserable.” Such people have permitted themselves to settle into this dependence. By contrast, that man is free from his habit, who can dispense with what it brings and continue his regular modes of activity. Very much depends on a man’s purpose in life, and the use to which he chooses to put his activities. His habits, neutral in themselves, are the means to this end. Man has power given him by the influx which reinforces his higher love, to turn in a spiritual direction; and, by thus turning, and by being confirmed in love for higher things, to carry with his chosen love all accessory habits essential to the realization of such a love. Furthermore, he can increase the efficiency of his habits by learning how they are generated and strengthened.

Another clue to mental origins is found in the doctrine of degrees. Although from creation, man has three discrete degrees (degrees of height), he comes into the first (natural) degree when born into the world. Man may develop this degree continuously until he becomes rational; he comes into the second, or spiritual degree, if he lives according to the laws of order. The various degrees are opened according to a man’s life, in this world, but not perceptibly and sensibly until after death, when man leaves the natural world. The chief point to note for our present purpose is that, while man lives in the natural world, he is in the natural degree of wisdom, and his freedom is “natural” freedom.

To see the force of this teaching, we begin by noting that man by birth is an “organ which lives solely in the external senses.” Our description of all that is native in him therefore takes its clue rather from his subservience to external conditions, than from the fact of his freedom. Thus, his appetites are “outermost affections of the body.”
This plane of man’s natural life being understood, our inquiry moves forward to the origins of knowledge on the natural plane. With the description of man’s relation to his bodily appetites belongs the teaching that it is the soul, not the body as such, which gives to the body an appetite, such as the longing for food. So, too, amidst the beginnings of sense-perception, however crude, the first plane of knowledge appears in accordance with what is to prove a highly important principle, the product known as “representation.”

The objects of the world, entering through the eyes, and storing themselves in the memory, are registered therein “under a visual shape.” This emphasis on visual imagery affords a clue to the nature of knowledge. Of yet, greater moment is the second fact: “when these objects appear still more interiorly, they present thought.” There is a general idea which rules all particulars of sense-knowledge, all objects of the senses (as known). Through this idea, external objects are presented to the mind, and ideas, as representatives, stand for all objects of the senses. We readily understand why the first ideas received from objects of sight are “material,” why man judges by appearances, acquiring “memory-knowledge” and depending on it as if this knowledge were final.

This process has readily been described, in part, in preceding chapters. The objects of experience, such as trees and houses, are represented in the mind by sense-perceptions which correspond to them. Sense-perceptions and external objections are not identical. Our seer is not venturing to assume that visible and tangible objects are “ideas” only. Our knowledge is representative from the first. Thought, building upon the deliverances of sense-perception, also corresponds to existent things. That is, thought reproduces by descriptions, symbols, figures of speech; by assimilating memory-images and drawing upon previously gained knowledge. An object, such as a tree, or an event, such as a contest between two men who are enemies, may
represent by interpretation some law of principle. Hence, all persons or things on earth may be interpreted as representatives, finding their places in the language of correspondences by which heavenly realities are portrayed in earthly speech.

A representative is, in brief, a thing, person, or event which stands for a principle. Objects coming within the sphere of the senses are included in the scale, and the nearer the Divine, the more intimately representative a thing is. So, too, the externals of man’s life in his body are representative with respect to influx from soul to body. Effects, or external deeds, represent the purposes which led to the production of these externals. Thus, representatives stand for ends. A representative is so named because of the correspondence between internal and external phases of the mind, implying the coming forth of the spiritual principle into the natural. The “effigy” or semblance thus externally portrayed, is another expression of this agreement between internal and external relations. The cause is invariably spiritual, the object in nature being the outermost image. There may be many other characteristics as well, as in case of man’s speech; the essential fact in such a case is that speech represents thought, while action represents will. So, in nature, at large objects are representative in so far as they correspond to the Divine, other aspects of an object being secondary. In a still larger sense, the temporal world stands for the eternal and the infinite.

External objects never show by themselves what it is in nature that is representative, because inwardly there is something active from the spiritual world that is not discoverable in an external way. Nor can analysis disclose the spiritual element. It is a question of agreement between dissimilar things, as diverse scriptural passages might be compared by means of an insight not suggested by any given passage. Granted insight into degrees as principles of explanation, natural objects may be seen in the light of the purposes for which they stand.
The spiritual state that is in one’s thought may seem remote, indeed, from the object brought into being in the world of things, to embody one’s purpose. Yet, when we discern its relationship to its external representative, the origin of all outward things becomes the more intelligible, also mental origins in general.

We may illustrate by the artistic work of a sculptor, with a mental image of a statue before him to guide his operations in carving a statue in marble. The given statue stands at last before the eyes of all, with varied suggestiveness. Among the several possible motives attributable to the sculptor, one alone is true, that mental image which the sculptor had in mind from the first. So, in the manifoldness of nature, spread before us in the beauty and order of a system, there is a central purpose universally represented. This purpose is depicted by the hand of the Master Artist. But the interpretation of nature depends upon a unifying insight which compasses the entire system in which each part is a representative according to type. The principle of origination is always from above and within to what is below and external.

All history is also representative. It may seem to be a mere retailing of dreary events and dates hard to remember by those unable to associate it with man’s spiritual history, thus, with Divine Providence. Or, again, the portrayal of alleged events may be undertaken for the purpose of embodying spiritual truths. In such a case words become “significatives,” in contrast with the deeper meaning already indicated when a word becomes a representative. Representatives would obviously have little meaning in the Divine order, unless the principles were universal.

This clue to the original meaning of events becomes plainer when we note the relation between representatives and imagination. To understand the part played by imagination, is to bear in mind the distinction between the interior and exterior memories, noting the fact that in each memory, there is a mental image. To follow our seer in this explanation is to disabuse the
mind of the popular identification of imagination with fancy or illusion, as if our imagery generated what is wholly unreal. Imagination pictures. But it does much more. All knowledge of the external world is dependent on sense-imagery of some sort. There are memory-images of sound, touch, odors, temperature, pain, and so to the end of the list. Our fancies do, indeed, build upon and sometimes greatly distort the real, as when a stump is mistaken for a bear in the woods at night. But, in building upon facts of experience, imagination depends on imagery derived through the senses in a way that is perfectly intelligible. Without constructive aid afforded by imagination, we could hardly follow our seer’s descriptions when, starting with visible objects as representatives, he leads the way into the spiritual world where imagery or another type is utilized.

Granted a description of things in the spiritual world that correspond to objects in the natural, such as houses, mountains, trees, imagination is given a new impetus. The relationship called “space” in that world is in correspondence with spiritual states, instead of being a fixed relationship of physical objects in a natural landscape, or events coming one after another in this world of time. The more secure one’s knowledge of heavenly doctrine, the less likelihood of such fantastic portrayals as religious people once indulged in when they pictured heaven as a place, with streets and gates visualized in the literal imagery of gold and pearl. Hence, imagination will more and more take its cue from spiritual truths, and we will cease to be literalists.

When we read a statement of doctrine concerning the spiritual world, we like to believe that what we read is literally true, word by word, as if imagination had nothing to do with it. But psychology shows that even our most abstract thought proceeds by means of imagery, even in mathematics. In the terms which our seer contributes, we advance much further in constructive
imagery by noting the difference between memory-knowledges dependent on the imagery of the physical senses, with a memory equipped accordingly (as exterior): and the higher type of knowledge about which we, as yet, know so little, involving as it does significatives, representatives and correspondences—a knowledge which leads our thought almost imperceptibly into the sphere of imagery pertaining to the interior memory. What we must do in order to follow through, is not to disavow imagination, but try to picture spiritual states in spheres where neither times nor spaces are fixed as we know them here. Eventually, we should be able to move readily from objects in (natural) space as representatives to their like in the language of correspondences, far more vividly portrayed in the spiritual world.

Starting with the fact that the exterior or corporeal memory is dependent on the forms and shapes of such things as man has taken up into his mind by means of visual imagery, we note that this imagery is varied and modified so as to constitute the basis of memory-knowledge in general. Here, the account is similar to the description of naturalistic psychology in our day. But a step beyond is taken with the proposition that man appropriates things according to his self-love, a function which does not enter ordinary psychology at all. When it is a question of the inward world, we find imagination fulfilling a function still further removed. Here the situation becomes a bit more complicated. For a person might be interested in his experiences, but in no enlightenment concerning them. The “first imagination of man” must be given its proper place in relation to memory-knowledges as already indicated. It will then become progressively possible for man to be enlightened by Divine light, so that his memory will be derived by aid of internal principles to which external imagery will be secondary. In quest of what is real and true, he will not be disconcerted by the fact that imagination still plays a part in his knowledge.
Furthermore, imagination and perception are intimately connected. So, imagination in any of its operations, may be affected by the type of perception, whether from an external light or from a spiritual. The external forms which appear before the mind in sense-perception may apparently be the same for all of us, while their internal forms are wholly different, according to the degree of enlightenment.\textsuperscript{262} Man’s “interior imagination” derives its forms and shapes by means of a higher type of perception than that of ordinary sense-perception. Hence our spiritual thought has higher imagery to draw upon in envisaging spiritual reality.\textsuperscript{263} These items of perception, also, are wonderfully varied or modified; some of these items of the imagination may “become animate from the influx of life from the Lord.” Very much may then depend upon the imagery and the principles admitted into this process, and on truths seen in a more or less clear light. It would seem inexcusable for one who follows this doctrine thoughtfully to lapse into literalism and, thus, to project mere words where one is called upon to envisage spiritual truths.

As people in mental states known collectively as “hell,” are in evil desires and “the derivative imagination of falsity,” so imagination plays its part in the wide range of affections from lowest self-love to highest celestial responses to Divine Love.\textsuperscript{264} We naturally give play to imagination according to the love which has reared for us our world of thought. Thus, one might indulge one’s imagination altogether too freely by thinking interiorly in oneself in an unfortunate way;\textsuperscript{265} daydreaming we call it in recent psychology. To man’s thought, whatever it may be, there pertains a sphere of the imagination and the clue to it is the underlying love.

Very few of us reduce our thinking to prosaic matters of fact, persistently trying to limit imagination to the minimum. We are likely to enlarge upon facts by appeal to preferences, by what we have read which interests us as “wonderful.” So, we idealize to the limit, reading favorite beliefs into things, creating our own significatives. But we overlook many of the
beautiful aspects of defensible convictions unless we realize that it is legitimate to reconstruct as well as to explain and interpret. Since “in every idea which is from the Lord there is an image of the whole heaven,” there is a wealth of detail which it is permissible to develop by considering what the term “image” means.266

The chief difficulty for most of us is that, as our ideas are founded on imagery taken from objects in space, we import these spatially founded ideas into our internal thought. This is because we are not accustomed to thought from spiritual ideas (“thought with the spirit”). Thus, we project spatial items into a realm above space, without making appropriate allowances. We are using imagination while unmindful of the fact that we are employing it. Since the Divine is not in space,267 all readers of this doctrine are forewarned. Since man is a spirit, living as to his interiors in a non-spatial world, we are doubly warned.

Man, as a spiritual being, is an image. But while the spiritual man is an image, the celestial man is a likeness. Hence, the imagery is higher in degree. The guiding principle here is the Divine image and likeness (both are non-spatial), not the imagery which would be suggested if we should take the outline and general appearance of man’s body as our guide. In other words, the basis of thought is a principle or truth, not a visible form, or tangible likeness. One is supposed to conceive of man’s spirit without materializing its structure. One’s thought will be of another type from the start if one follows the clue afforded by spiritually enlightened ideas concerning qualities which can indeed by represented by external things, but which in quality pertain to a higher sphere.

External things may correspond to spiritual realities yet be radically unlike them. The human mind is indeed manifested in the brain by means of which it externally functions in the natural world, but how different is a mind from brain! When we read that “nothing except love
and charity can may a likeness of anyone,“ we are not reading about a spatial image. If the sphere of a spirit is, as it were, his image extended outside of himself, so that his image exhibits whatever is inside,“ this extension is not of things in space; it is to be understood in the light of the doctrine concerning spiritual spheres.

So, in general, one is asked to regard all things with reference to inner states which are externally manifested, noting all the while that “appearances” in the realm in question start from these changing states, while reality is to be understood by envisaging Divine truth. Since “every affection of man, nay, every idea of his thought, is an image,” we need a conception of spiritual imagination, depicting human affections in their real relations. To interpret spiritually, so as rightly to think by reference to correspondences, is to penetrate behind material appearances in quest of the spiritual quality or principle which such appearances merely stand for but may in no visible or tangible way resemble.

Since man both thinks and wills from that which reigns within him, one can supply the element of imagination even when the terms themselves are not explicit. The Divine “appears to everyone according to his quality,” and “Divine truth is received by man according to his quality.” As the quality varies with the man, his sphere varies, also. So, our insight into his life varies with the degree of enlightenment vouchsafed to us. If we could regard a man with the eyes of purely spiritual perception, we would know with great precision the type of charity and faith reigning in him. Effort is required to stop and truly realize in what sense man is “an image of heaven.” Sense-imagery persistently intrudes. We find ourselves mistaking bodies for minds. We lapse from the spiritual imagery of our interior memory. But our doctrine always supplies the needed reminders.
Lest we regard the body as too remote because it “represents” the spirit, as our knowledge represents nature, we are reminded that mind speaks and acts through its organs in the body. Interiorly, the body is the form of the mind exteriorly organized, the mind being interiorly the form of the body. The essential difference is that the body is exteriorly organized, being, in brief, “an organ of life,” so formed as to produce what love wills and understanding thinks. Hence the physical organism becomes intelligible only so far as, viewing all activities from within, we see the end which is fulfilled.

Plainly, the term “life” thus used, is not biological in the meaning current today, as if life were a bodily product due to chemical forces functioning under purely physical conditions. Life is not subject to microscopic analysis. It contains the efficiency of all activities manifested by spirit, whose functions are made possible by Infinite Spirit, Life being the basis of all forms of life as a human term. Thus regarded, life in its organized modes, utilizing organs, and achieving ends, is the central energy of the body. Even bodily life, therefore, is more than all physical and chemical forces combined, and higher in type. Love, as elsewhere, is the secret power within the representative behavior.

Life uses energy and matter, but scarcely seems to belong to the physical frame of things. It does not exert force as physical, yet forces are activated, and physical objects move. Again, life loves and hopes, manifesting yet other attributes or qualities not specifically physical. In
order that it may act, with or in the physical, life is provided with a body as its instrument, appropriately called an organism.

Since all efficiency or causality is spiritual by descent or influx from within-outward, all mental processes follow the same course or order, meeting activities from the sense-world and from within the body. Hence, there is no need in this doctrine for a principle from the visible world into the mental, as if mind were produced by material agencies working from simple to complex. Pausing for a moment to consider this point, we observe that on such a view sense-perception would underlie all knowledge, as if there were nothing in the sphere of thought not previously in the senses. This would conflict with the idea of a descent from the Divine into the spiritual, thence, into the natural, as the invariable basis of an ascent; so it would prove to be a fallacy.

Something would depend, however, on the way evolution is construed. Our seer’s later doctrines have sometimes been interpreted from the viewpoint of his scientific works written when his interest was in the cosmos at large, as if his theological writings were extensions of his earlier teaching, regarded, in turn, as harmonious with modern theories of evolution. According to this mode of interpretation, the connecting link is found in his concept of *conatus* (endeavor), a term used both in his scientific and in his theological works. Thus, *conatus* becomes universal, as an endeavor permeating the three kingdoms of nature and looking upward, so to speak, toward the complete production of man. *Conatus* then becomes, by interpretation, *will*. So, we seem to have gained a complete picture of the world-process, beginning with an involution of the Divine creative endeavor, and extending up through the entire series of things and beings.
Unless we understand, however, that such a version of the seer’s works, as a whole, is in the interest of cosmology, we might be seriously misled. The purport of the theological works is in many respects profoundly different from those concerned with the physical cosmos. The psychology differs accordingly. Our seer’s later interest is in man, the Word, the Lord. Hence, the significance of his new approach to mind, not of “endeavor” in the cosmical sense, but that of influx as the higher term, and that of graduated descent from plane to plane, as of more truth-filled meaning than any ascent. The interests that are paramount for the evolutionist are secondary when put in their Divine setting. Secondary, also, are the beginnings of sense-perception, no longer a great cosmical event. The descent is an involution (if the term may be used) which no evolutionism could account for. In terms of a prior descent essential to any ascent, our seer is much nearer Plotinus than Darwin, or any later evolutionist. To regard him as an evolutionist from a nineteenth century viewpoint, would be to disregard what is most distinctive in his theological works, which presuppose a revelation of principles different by a discrete degree from all forces taken for granted in evolutionism.

It does not follow that the later doctrine denies the more firmly established views of modern science at its best. But to avoid confusion of ideas in psychology, it is better to use such terms as “development” and “growth” with reference to the successive stages of mental change from infancy onwards, with the understanding that this advance—both as sequential growth and as manifesting higher qualities now described as “emerging” into action—is caused by influx from within, not by forces operating from below or without, as if by “chance variation,” by “use and disuse,” or some other factor attributed to purely physical forces. No one is able to deny the existence of successive forms which life has taken on in the changes from lower to higher. The crucial question is the origin of species, types, energies, physical, and chemical forces. All
having been attributed to Divine influx, to Spirit going forth into productivity in the universe, we are in possession of the principle without which mental growth cannot be understood, either in the processes of sense-perception, or in the change from stage to stage as man attains maturity. Endeavor becomes intelligible as a psychological term only in case we attribute desire to its proper place in this development, having first learned that love-will is higher, universal in type.

Any reference to the powers of man as “unfolding,” presupposes the graduated causal chain through which such “development” is made possible. Such terms are, therefore, merely descriptive, like references to the “plane” prepared to receive the Divine implantations which are to be developed in accordance with man’s awakening. Presupposed, is man’s native capacity for response to successive stirrings of these implantations from stage to stage, as man advances to the spiritual plane. Man is, by Divine creation, in heavenly purpose very much more than his primitive beginnings indicate. The lower stage, which in terms of modern evolutionism, is often said to be capable of producing the higher, is explicitly for the sake of the higher and highest yet to come. The higher is not, in any sense, an attainment of the lower. Nor, is man’s first capacity for response, an achievement of earlier processes in the animal kingdom. The principle of explanation is never biological. Creation, in the sense of a new species, thus a higher type of existence with distinctive capacities separating man from the highest animals, is the prerequisite.

Starting with the idea of inborn principles which lead to development, we chronicle the fact that man is not born into knowledge, but only in the capacity to receive knowledge. Nor is he born into reason. He is, in fact, destitute of innate ideas. What he possesses is the ability to know, understand and become wise, with an inclination to love. He must then learn the principles which enable him to exercise his intellectual capacity, principles which he will employ more and more.
This process of acquiring knowledge, hence ideas, in general, begins chiefly through the sense-items of a lesser mode of knowledge apprehended through sight and hearing, as already noted in case of memory-knowledge and imagination. Enriching his memory by knowledge gained through experience, man cultivates his understanding by this means, and through the use of will. Memory is of the natural man, that is memory brought thus early into exercise; while the understanding and the will, which utilize this subject-matter, are spiritual powers. Man is born natural. He lives a natural existence until he becomes rational. He can be led by Divine influx and become spiritual. That is to say, man is born like an animal, into ignorance, unaware of his true nature. He becomes a man through the awakening of freedom and rationality.

Yet, already in his native state, man has a potential spiritual mind, which the Lord preserves in its integrity, that he may become truly a man. Not in his fullness, in the beginning, he is led into fullness of selfhood by stages. What activates him, meanwhile, is life going forth from the Divine into his spirit, conjoined with his spiritual mind and, thence, proceeding forth into the quickening activities which stir dormant capacities. The clue to mental growth is thus to be taken from within and above, rather than by any analysis of those promptings toward self-love, which are interpreted by reference to heredity. The first consideration is man’s pristine state. For it is by appeal to this, that we can understand spiritual perception as a very high development.

The general principle that man was created so that Divine life should descend through his whole nature, and ascend from what is external to the Lord, so that man should unite God and nature, and what is outermost live from the Divine, applies primarily to man the type, in the Divine image and likeness according to the Divine order. But man, as born into the nature of his parents, his grandparents, and ancestors for ages back, is born into a succession of
accumulated states. Hence, his mental development begins and long continues as a struggle with states prompting him to love himself above others, to covet what belongs to another, to take thought for himself alone, or, for others only for the sake of self. The order into which man was created, if regnant with him, would have prompted him to love the neighbor as, or even more, than himself. Therefore, his mental growth would have been radically different.

Actual mental growth is then to be distinguished from spiritual potentiality, which remains essentially an ideal. If the potential were actual, man would possess all spiritual truths and celestial goods. He would be ruled by heavenly influx only. His interiors were formed for this high purpose. But, although man is by creation “a form of Divine order,” his love, wisdom, goods, and truths are his own. It is the appearance which first functions in his conscious experience. Hence, man only gradually becomes aware that he is born with higher capacities, that he may be conjoined with the Lord. Only gradually does he learn that he was created according to the type of both worlds. It is also to be observed that, as man was born into the capacity for knowledge from the inclination to love, so he was endowed with freedom. This endowment made possible the choice of evil instead of good desires, with a mixed growth as a result. Finally, although he was born with the possibility that he might take on evils of every kind, he was endowed with an ability to keep spiritual, by removal of these evils. If we would know where man stands today in mental development, we must then take into account both the potentialities from the Divine (only partly recognized), and the human inheritances, and various quickened capacities, amidst which the individual is brought to self-awareness. Man’s growth is from ignorance into slowly acquired knowledge. Ideally, the spiritual life might have been a marvelous unfolding of powers from within in response to Divine influx. It will be observed that this view of mental development is wide as the poles asunder from evolution proceeding by
natural selection, the survival of the fittest, or any similar process attributed to human acquirement.

There are four stages of development through which the individual passes in his mental advance to complete life as a spirit. These phases are termed “ages,” as if they were simply chronological periods. But the term “age” here signifies state, all temporal periods being due to states and successions or groupings of mental and spiritual states.

The first covers four years of the infant’s life, described in brief as infancy. Negatively, this is the period of ignorance. The infant receives sense-impressions of various kinds, but is unaware of them, as we discriminate perception from sensation in later life. He possesses multiform capacities, but these are mostly latent. Hence the terms which we apply to mental maturity should not be used in the sense in which we ordinarily employ them. Strictly speaking, there are no ideas in the infant’s mind, there is no will or love as we will or love when aware of distinctions between volition or affection, and objects of will and love. There are endless capacities for forming ideas, and arriving at the period of choice or volition, also innate principles of intellect or understanding. Multitudes of impressions are being produced, to be organized into ideas and varied forms of activity. The Divine influx is, of course, present and active, but without the oppositions due to self-love when such affection actuates the mature mind.

When man is born, he is introduced into a state of innocence by means of celestial influences surrounding the infant. The state of affection of celestial good or love toward patents, nurses, and others, comes later; then a state of affection of spiritual good or mutual love. True
innocence is, of course, impossible without love and charity, but these qualities are added in due
time. Stress falls on ignorance at first.

The three degrees of innocence—suckling infants, infants, and little children—correspond to three degrees of love: tender love, love as of an infant toward parents, and charity as of a little child toward his teachers. Innocence as true infancy in the sense of a spiritual state to which we give praise is identified with wisdom. But, as knowledges are essential to this state, wisdom belongs to a much later period.

Recently born infants, devoid of ideas, are endowed with no reason. But young people become rational through gradual development by means of external and internal sensuous things, after their minds are imbued with knowledges. Even in childhood, these matters are only the beginnings of reason.

Infants are also equipped from birth with certain blind inclinations and propensities. All are born without any good whatever, that is, goodness from themselves. They are defiled with hereditary evils in the sense in which heredity is later to be explained in these chapters. But these inclinations are not yet active. The hereditary evils are dormant. The innocence of the infants is external to hereditary evils. For this innocence, being due to influx and celestial associates, has not yet been assimilated into the sphere of thought and will. The mind is, therefore, far too immature to recognize and to choose, either to welcome, or to turn against evil. The infant’s mind is tenderly guarded until the period of choice becomes possible.

The goods of infancy are “insinuated” into man from his birth, to the period when he begins to be instructed and to know something. These goods are contrasted with the “goods of
intelligence,” and introduced when man can reflect upon what is good and true. The “goods of infancy” are not limited to the period of five years of age but extend to the tenth year.

Infants are in good, but not in the “good of doctrine.” Hence, they do not yet possess truth. The state of infancy, in so far as it is the period of the infancy of intelligence and wisdom, is prior to the stage of ignorance which persists until man begins to become rational.

Man is introduced into a state of innocence as soon as born, that this state may be a plane for all subsequent states. Thus, the good of innocence is essential to the good of doctrine and essential to truth. The good is, then, the first-born with every man. “This good into which man is thus initiated when an infant remains. For whatever is imbibed from infancy enters life. If man were without such good, he would not be man, but more of a wild beast than any in the forest. This good does not indeed appear to be present, because what is imbibed in the infantile stage does not appear otherwise than as something natural,” as is sufficiently manifested from walking, and from motions of the body in general, and from the manners and decorum’s of civil life, and allied actions. We note, then, that the implied good of infancy, and the life proceeding from it, is not spiritual good, but is to be distinguished from all goods involving intelligence. This good later becomes spiritual when truths have been implanted, more explicitly, when regeneration comes about.

So, too, the things which man sees and feels in infancy are most general, the being added or brought to awareness much later. But the particulars of experience and knowledge are present in potency. Fortunately, the hereditary evils are also merely latent until the period when particulars stand forth, a period which dawns when man acts from his own understanding and will. Since it is the exterior natural plane that is formed first in infancy, the mode of life or
experience, if it may be so called, is limited to that plane. As the innocence of infants is only external, it cannot be conjoined with any wisdom. Nor, is the mere ignorance to be praised. For, in ignorance itself, there can be no significant innocence. There may indeed by in time a childhood state which is holy, because innocent; for ignorance never takes away holiness when there is innocence in it. The state of innocence described as essential to man, is not the same as infancy, but is understood in the light of intelligence and wisdom.

The assumption that innocence is the same as infancy comes about because in the New Testament it is said, “of such is the kingdom of heaven.” Hence, those who do not become as little children cannot enter heaven. But the common belief in this respect implies neglect of the internal sense of the Word. The state referred to is that of the intelligence and wisdom in which man acknowledges that he has no life save from the Lord alone, and that the Lord is his real father. Innocence itself, then, has no abode except in wisdom, so that the wiser one is the more innocent. By contrast, the innocence of little children, devoid as they are of intelligence and wisdom is, at best, a plane for receiving wisdom in proportion as the individual becomes wise, however long this process may take. In little children this innocence may sometimes be as wooden as a thing almost devoid of life. But genuine innocence may, indeed, be represented as a most beautiful child, full of life, in the purity of unspoiled nakedness. Of no such nakedness need anyone be ashamed. So, too, the wiser angel is the more innocent, and the more an angel appears to himself as a little child.

The general principle is that, “in all good there must be innocence in order that it may be good. Charity without innocence is not charity; and still less is love to the Lord possible without innocence.” To be genuinely innocent in the same sense of goodness is to know, acknowledge, believe, not with the mouth, but with the heart, that evil is from self, while all goodness is in the
Lord. This means attributing the blackness of evil to will, and the falsity to understanding. To be in this confession of belief from the heart, is to be in a state where the Lord “flows in with good and truth,” and insinuates into man a heavenly principle which is white and lustrous. No one can be in true humility unless in this acknowledgment and belief is from the heart.

The second stage, from the fifth to the twentieth year, is that of childhood, and includes the whole period through adolescence, to the dawning of manhood.\textsuperscript{291} This is the age when sense-impressions and other experiences having been sufficiently accumulated, and when the growing mind begins to raise questions on a multitude of subjects, eagerly asking information, manifesting curiosity, and responding to various types of instruction. The term intelligence does not properly apply to the beginnings of this period. But the child is at least ready to believe on authority, preparatory to raising doubts and arriving at individual conclusions.

At first the child knows from memory only, from what has been learned. Thus, the child recalls the teachings of the Bible, the home, the school. Matters thus acquired afford material for later discrimination between truth and falsity, by oppositions and contrasts between various teachings. The little child at first believes parents, nurses, teachers, and books, before he believes what is taught as doctrine or truth. Later, comes the period of development in the light of thoughts which the mind recognizes as its own.

Celestial things are insinuated into man without his knowledge from his infancy up to his childhood, while celestial principles with knowledges are introduced from childhood to adult age.\textsuperscript{292} A reason for this difference in favor of early childhood is found in the fact that infants and children are more in “celestial things” than adults, because in love toward their parents and in mutual love, also in innocence. Yet, whatever is acquired in childhood, is a plane for later
development. Thus, memory-knowledges are acquired that the child may be taught to think afterwards. Again, the will in man is formed by the Lord from infancy to childhood by the insinuation of innocence and charity toward parents, nurses, and others. The term plane is here to be understood as a means of receptivity, such that the mind may be imbued with knowledges, and later arriving at understanding. While man is first being imbued with goods and truths, he is kept by the Lord in the affirmative, namely, that what is said and taught by parents and masters is true.

When a child is first instructed, he is affected with a desire to know, not from any end manifest to himself, but by a separate pleasure and connate delight. What is implanted is not his possession until he acts according to it from affection. A further reason for the delay is found in the fact that, from infancy to childhood, man is merely sensuous: he receives only earthly, bodily, and worldly things through the external senses. From these sense-impressions the first ideas are formed. The communication with the interior man is not yet open, or, in any case, only so far as to permit the retaining and recognition of these external matters. By external innocence, the Lord reduces to order the data or items received through the senses. Unless there was an influx from the Lord in that first stage, there would never be any foundation upon which to build the intellectual or rational faculty proper to man.

From childhood, to early youth, there is communication between the interior natural through acquisition of that which is fitting or conventional, the learning of what civil laws require, what is honorable. From youth to early manhood, communication is open between the natural and the rational. This is secured by learning the truths and goods of spiritual life through the hearing and reading of the Word. The rational is opened in so far as the youth becomes
imbued with goods by means of truths; or, more explicitly, in so far as he applies the truths which he learns. Otherwise, the knowledges remain in the natural stage, in the memory.

The state which continues from the fifth to the twentieth year is, then, a state of instruction and knowledge but not yet a state of intelligence, because a child does not yet form any conclusions from himself, does not discriminate between truths, knowledges, and falsities in the sense in which in mature life we distinguish what we call a conviction. The child merely thinks and speaks matters of the memory from what may be classed as “mere knowledge.” He does not see or perceive whether a statement is so, save from the faith of a master who declares a statement to be true.298 This, then, is the period of belief on authority.

The child’s life, as a progression from the initial stage of the primary department, has been described by Eugene Joseph Emanuel Schreck, a Swedenborgian, as an advance up a stairway by discrete steps, as beautifully portrayed in the dream which Jacob had at Bethel.299 Jacob dreamed of a ladder as “a way of steps, set upon on the earth, and its head reaching heaven, and the angels of God ascending and descending on it, and the Lord above it. By this impressive dream, the Lord has pictured for us the Divine psychology. As a step in a ladder or a stairway rises, from a lower plane to a higher, so the senses constitute a step, the child’s first step. He can mount this step, which rises from the plane of things material to a higher plane. And in this upward movement, the angels have him by the hand. They are those angels of God which are ascending the stairs.

If you wish to differentiate between the surrounding world and man’s own material body, you may picture the sense-organs as the platform on Bethel’s ground from which rises man’s psychological stairway. . . . The lowest platform, labeled ‘sense-organs,’
represents the whole natural body of which the organs are the ‘natural mind’ or ‘external man,’ the greater distinction between which is indicated by the turn and the platform toward the inmost or soul into which flows life from the Lord, represented by the sun as fit symbol of Him who is the Sun or Righteousness and the Lord eternal.

Following out of this symbolism from the plane of the natural organs into which flow the influences which contribute sense-impressions in the lowest portion of the mind, Schreck indicates actual recognition of an object, or knowledge of it, as the next step higher. Mental grasp of the facts of a phenomenon or story presented by the object, when these phases of it are taken together, is the subsequent step, the moral lesson being the third. The spiritual lesson, connecting with heaven, would be still another, the celestial lesson higher still. So, the angels of sympathy and love may be said to lead the infant, child, youth, or man, up the stairway of the soul. But these angels come down again, all the while, with increased light and warmth from the Lord, to lead to the carrying out of the purpose of the Divine story.

The stage of instruction and memory-knowledge called childhood and youth gives place at twenty to the third stage, that of intelligence, from the twentieth to the sixtieth year. This period includes adolescent intelligence as sometimes described, young manhood, and manhood. It is known as the age of intelligence because man then thinks of himself, discriminates propositions and arrives at conclusions. He then takes home his knowledge as his own, not another’s. Here, too, faith begins, for man now affirms and denies, makes comparisons, and confirms what he believes by ideas in which he puts credence. Before this stage of mentality, such faith as man seems to possess, is vested in persons and authorities. But he now thinks for himself, with his own assumptions, not from his instructors. This is not only because his nature is more extensively self-assertive, but because his interiors are open toward heaven. These interiors
are in heaven, not in the world and, in them, is the possibility of inflowing light as the source of true intelligence and wisdom. Intelligence, as thus understood, increases according to the degree to which man lives for heaven and not for the world.

The last stage, from the sixtieth year upward, is a state of wisdom and of innocence in wisdom, of genuine wisdom. Man is no longer concerned about the mere understanding of principles of goods and truths, but about willing and living by these principles. The innocence of this period, in the willing of truths and goods that a man may live by them, is due to recognition of the truth that man has no wisdom from himself, but solely from the Lord. His innocence is also since he loves to have this so, loves to make acknowledgment. The innocence is internal, in contrast with the external innocence of childhood. Man now actually knows that, of himself, he is ignorant. He also surely knows that whatever truth he possesses, is from the Lord.

From the succession of these states the man who is wise may also see the wonderful things of the Divine Providence, which are that a prior state is constantly the plane of the states which follow, and that the opening of interiors proceeds successively from outermosts even to inmost, and at last so that what was first (namely ignorance and innocence), but in outermosts, is also last, but in inmost; for he who knows that of himself he is ignorant of all things, and that whatever he knows is from the Lord, is in the ignorance of wisdom, and also in the innocence of wisdom.301

About the series of states of man’s life through which man passes during his existence in this world, it is to be noted that the transitions into these years are not apparent except by intervals of time.302
Reason sees that there is development from moment to moment and so continually. For in this respect the human being is like a tree, which grows and develops in each fraction of time from the moment the seed is cast into the earth. This unintermitted progress also involves changes of state, for what ensues contributes something to what precedes, perfecting the state. Changes, moreover, which take place in man’s internals also have a more perfect continuity than those which take place in the externals. For man’s internals (by which are meant the things of his mind or spirit) are a degree higher, elevated above the externals; and in what is of the higher degree a thousand things take place in the same instant in which only one takes place in externals. The changes which occur in intervals are changes of state in the will as to affections, and changes of state in the understanding as to thoughts. It is these successive changes of state especially which are meant in our proposition. Changes of state in these two lives or faculties continue with man from infancy to the close of life and afterward to eternity.  

We note also that, whereas in most systems of psychology, mental development is traced from the period of sense-impressions to that of reason, as if there was an ascent only, in this doctrine the development is explained as due from the first, to the descent of heavenly influences such that the celestial precedes the spiritual. Therefore, the real development is from within-outward, even when it seems to be due to the influence of external events and things.
Chapter 18

Love

In making the transition from the more technical subject of Will, to love as intensely human, we are reminded of literature as a portrayal of the affections which we know by living experience. In romances, drama, most types of poetry, film-plays, and short stories, love is a value or ideal, rather than a matter of fact. Hence, it is appreciable by appeal to “real life,” as we say. We have living people in mind as we read. Love is the last subject in the world to be abstracted from personality, as felt or perceived by actual “presences” or “spheres.” In this sense of the word, people are far from being specimens to be reduced to motives. So, we protest all psychologies in which the affections are identified with the “libido,” or some equivalent term, running into sex-realism. It is a relief to encounter a statement that “love is the life of man.”

Yet, in these chapters, we have had to do much abstracting to be true to our author, who delimits, refines, and qualifies almost beyond precedent, in endless contrasts between goods and truths, interiors and exteriors. To give attention to the requisite distinctions, we must omit the illustrative evidence which would make the doctrines warm and vivid. Very much is left to the reader to supply, if terms like “receptacle,” shall become vitalizing words in the inner life as we know it.

Manifold in its nature, varied beyond description in its expression and influence, love is, indeed, more truly the “life” than any other quality. So, this is especially a psychology of love, love being the heart of the soul, despite the inseparability of love-will and the understanding. Our
seer’s insight into the nature of love with respect to the soul, was the culmination of the long years of investigation that preceded. So, it need not seem to be the greatest abstraction.

From the first, the effort of these chapters has been to describe inner states as anybody apprehends them in real experience. Hence, we have kept these states in the foreground as already containing the activities which are interpretable by appeal to influx, and as related by the principle or law of spiritual correspondences. Yet, with the living context, our study has had to depart into such matters as sensations and fibers, the interchange between mind and brain, or fine distinctions between “soul” and “spirit,” by deserting the feeling-values of the inner life, in favor of a minute analysis which was in danger of becoming dull in the long series of antitheses between inmost and ultimates. Even when considering the nature of will, we left out the more familiar references to “power,” for the doctrines show the need of distinguishing what seems to be ours, from what we merely share as Divine in origin.

So, as our study proceeds, we are in thought or spirit dwelling the more intensively in a doctrinal world, howbeit we are valiantly trying to discern real life. Love is a synonym for union, hence, for marriage, and marital love is the culminating topic of the psychology. Yet, we are still postponing. As Divine in origin, love is nothing if not unselfish: love for others, for the neighbor, from the through love for the Lord. But, again, we discriminate because love may be either uplift of heart and will, or a down-reaching affection for the world and for self, thus, with a selfish trend which, in a way, make it the great dynamic for all these antithetical descriptions. Any statement concerning love, in a praiseworthy sense, involves its opposite. We are not at liberty to select one group of values and neglect another. Man’s whole existence here, is a state of changing equilibrium between the two types of love, each of which implies a world. Man will be unstable until he learns what love is, what alternatives lie before him. He has both a ruling
passion and a love which inspires conjunction with spiritual realities. He is ruled by love, and he rules both body and mind by love in some form. But love is distributively its affections, and these imply thoughts, thus conduct; and so, the whole sphere of behavior in which a contest of motives is ever going on. We must persistently qualify in order to understand. Yet, if we qualify over much, our study becomes lost in dull details.

In terms of our native experience, love is plainly the “life” in the vaguest sense only: as the implied activity within all inner states prior to any discovery on our part that there are two types of affection. In truth, love causes man to be man: it pertains to the beginnings of everything in his nature, in both causes and ends. But man knows very little at the outset, even in early manhood, concerning the springs of his activity as doctrine reveals them. All delight and bliss are from love, which, as the essence of life, forms man according to its own image at the end or purpose with which all phases of his activity are imbued. Yet, in his natural-mindedness, man habitually judges by bodily wants and mundane ambitions. All goods and truths belong in this same context of love as “life.” But love is, thus far, only in ideal in light of his life. So, in brief, much depends on what the words mean to us when we read that love is the will of man, derivatively his thought, and thus his conduct; or, that love in fact remains with him, whatever else dissipates, as the long series of antithetical inner states proceed. Assuredly, the activity (use) itself which a man loves, determines his daily trend; since it is love in each case which gives the initiating life, and is throughout the central clue. This will remain a general statement, however, unless we revert to an actual motive to see how its history involves the use all the way along and eventually rises toward its goal.

Still pursuing general statements, we note, for example, that whatever a man loves, reigns in him by producing a sphere with its attendant affections allying him with other people. Thus,
the beauty which shines forth in the countenances of some people, admits us appreciatively into their sphere. Love unites minds as well as hearts. Love is the spiritual quality, while the natural element is the “delight of consociation.” When speaking of its spiritual values, then, we identify it with the heavenward side of the long series of antitheses, supplying the nether side to complete the contrast.

The type of love also determines by whom a man is led. This is his own love. Hence, when a man loves himself more than the neighbor, he leads himself. But, if he loves Divine good, he is led by it, and hence, by the Lord. All love has a force of attraction in it, for it seeks conjunction with its object. Longing is, of course, to be distinguished from evil desires, although striving is always characteristic of love. Whatever is loved, “enters with light into the idea of the mind;” and what a man loves, he sees in light, what he does not love, in shade. The latter he rejects, the former he chooses. The light of truth with a man is entirely according to the state of his love: as the love is kindled, so the love shines. That which anyone loves, remains inscribed on his heart. Hence, he not only thinks but acts from it. There are ways for every love, and love opens the way, howbeit in all social relationships, much depends on what is reciprocal.

If anyone loves another and is not loved in return, then as the one accedes the other recedes; whereas if he loves in return, then as the one accedes so the other accedes, and conjunction is effected; for love wants to be loved; this [tendency] is implanted in it; and in proportion is it is loved back, in the same proportion, is it in itself and in its delight.

Goods and truths seem to have life in themselves to affect our minds, but love gives the life, goods, and truths, thus far instrumental: anything that favors love is taken to be good. So,
too, wisdom and intelligence derive their quality from love, because influx is above the love. All freedom is from love, the great instance being in marital love at its best. Created in love toward the Lord and man, his is the love “proper to man,” whatever else is true of man’s nature. Love is so inherently in every phase of man’s life that every end a man pursues is from his love even when thought is not in accord with conduct. For, despite any appearance due to man’s outward life, or what he thinks, he is really actuated by love as the determinant, with the affections that attend it.

Love to the Lord is, of course, “true” love, thus the type, and with it, love to the neighbor. Love is of the Lord as the fountain and origin of all celestial and spiritual love. Hence, true love is “not a whit” of man, not even love towards companions, if these are loved solely for the sake of self without the Divine element. A man might know many truths from the Word and be able to speak about them from memory. But only when he loves them from the heart, acknowledging the love and charity, does the Divine enter these truths to make them expressive of love. It is when one loves another as himself, so that one sees the other in himself, and himself in other, that love really conjoins. So, it is the life of charity which constitutes the effective unity of truths with goods; it is the love and charity which unite the internal with the external man.

Loves of self and the world are, at best, “something like” love that is simulations which, as desires, impede the influx of celestial love. It is, indeed, only as a “first idea,” that love begins with self. The loves of self and the world are disjunctions, although appearing as unions. Through these a man looks below himself: from true love he looks above. True love is mutual, in contrast with “loves so-called,” and their attendant evil desires. Specifically, love as first from the Lord, becomes reciprocal by being received, while by mutual love, it becomes a “marriage.” Given mutuality, genuine love of parents towards children may follow, also love of brothers
toward each other, and love toward relatives, thus love in all degrees and orders. As love towards
the neighbor receives the life of heaven, while love of self is infernal, there is the sharpest
contrast. Thus, the spiritual principle once more gives the standard by which we are to estimate
mental states in the long scale of descent from highest to lowest.

Still, giving full recognition to these fine distinctions, we note that, in heavenly love,
there is “utter aversion” to doing well for the sake of self, but promptings toward the good in
another person which he receives from the Lord. To love anyone, and not to do good to him
when able, is not to love. It is love which determines the degree in which each man is the
neighbor: angels love others more than themselves. They only have spiritual life who are in
heavenly love and, thence, in spiritual knowledge. From love to the Lord and the neighbor
come all requisite knowledge, intelligence, and wisdom. Spiritual love wishes to give its own to
another, with the peace and blessedness resulting. This is because of the Divine element. In such
love, there is an image and likeness, the former being the love, the latter the wisdom, and each
being dependent on the other. Wisdom, when not with love, would be merely apparent. So, too,
with love when it seems to be alone. Through conjunction arise delights, pleasantness,
deliciousness, sweetness, bliss, happiness, and felicity. To say then that love spiritually makes
the man is always to realize that this means love and wisdom.

Love is the determining element, not wisdom: the love of knowing and being wise, and of
applying wisdom to life. Hence, love is the basis of classification, and the reigning love is
decisive in the whole mind and disposition, from what is primary, to what is most externally
derivative in brain and body. Everything turns then upon the kind of love, for it is the dominant
love that makes the man. Subordinate to this are many affections which form one kingdom
under this “king.” Hence, one distinguishes between the state of man, as particularly his love,
and the changes of state which constitute his affections. Love does, wisdom teaches. That
which love manifests by doing at its best is good. What wisdom teaches is truth. At their best,
love and wisdom function “simultaneously and unanimously” in reciprocal union.

It is also plain that there is intimate relation between types of love and the opening of
degrees, with reference to the kind of union attained on each level, the ascent of love being
according to degrees. Hence, it is a question of the natural, spiritual, and celestial in successive
orders. Rational life requires spiritual as well as natural love, although there is a measure of
rational thought before spiritual life awakens. Spiritual love is known by its promptings to give
what is its own to another, and by its source. Man can “let himself into” natural love, but the
Lord alone can let him into spiritual love. Celestial love does not want to be its own, but wants
to give to others, and is constituted by what is in the Lord’s kingdom, as pure love in relation to
the Lord and the neighbor, all its attributes being pure. This, in general, is the celestial with man.
This love includes in highest form, marital love, love towards infants, and mutual or social love,
the marital type being the highest of all types.

As love and wisdom belong together, in their best estate, love and faith are one also. Faith is of the understanding, love of the will, where distinctions are needed: faith is the form, and love contains faith. A man’s faith is known from that for which he fights: to fight from faith is to fight from love toward the Lord and the neighbor. Thus, faith and love are real tests of belief. No less intimate is the relation between love and good, as love’s essence, the relation to form, thus to unity, and the secret of all variety in unity. Internal man is, indeed, the “form of his love,” in contrast with the manifold concealments of the external man. Thus, the term takes on more contrast as the description proceeds. Love and wisdom would have no terminus without “use” to ground them in concrete deeds. Love, wisdom, and their unity in an “end” are
inseparable. The end fulfills the intention. Wisdom makes it practical. What is loved is therefore purposive. These three follow in succession in our life because they follow in the Divine.\textsuperscript{324}

Three universal loves—of heaven, the world, and self—are in every man from creation, hence, from birth, although love is not “creatable.” Any so-called “strange” love is due to misdirection of affections destined for higher ends, as in turning love for the Lord and the neighbor into self-love, which in verity is infernal and produces evils of every kind: conceit, pride, avarice, envy, revenge, and unmercifulness. The evil of it is hatred against the neighbor, thence, a blazing desire for revenge, with its attendant evils. Self-love produces evils of every kind in proportion as it reigns, as our seer makes plain in his study of the nether side of sexual affection in all its modes, in contrast with true marital love. Yet, love of self and the world contain charity as a common element and, when rightly subordinated, these affections aid in perfecting man.\textsuperscript{325} Right coordination means that man will not seek to dominate his neighbor or covet his goods. “He who has subjugated the love of dominion from the love of self easily subjugates all the other evil loves, because this is their head.”\textsuperscript{326} While the loves of self and the world are “filthy,” in another sense filthy and infernal loves are not loves, but hatreds, their proper use not having been found by subordination. When a man abstains from hatred, love inflows.

In a sense, every man is in the same situation, for everyone has a reigning love which he pursues as his end, with affections subordinate to it.\textsuperscript{327} This dominating love is in all the derivative affections, directing and using them as means, articulating itself in his intentions, constantly present in thought and will as his “veriest life.” Since he is distinguished from other men by his love, there is an element of individuality in it; and, so far as it is effective through
concentration and usefulness in the world, it pertains to what is good. So, it becomes a basis for higher purposes.

Nothing increases with man unless there is some affection, the delight of affection being that which causes it to grow. Love enkindles and vivifies, as we note in the way it animates thought. The “life’s love” cannot, in fact, exist without affections. Evil affections are more strictly speaking lusts, while the heavenly are good. It is by affection that influx proceeds from interior to exterior, affections of the external man being allotted to their own uses, notably those relating to knowledge. Affection varies with the end, every affection being an image of the man; hence, it gives individual expression to the various enjoyments, pleasantness and delights. An affection is not, in fact, perceived except by what is pleasant. Its correspondence is seen, for example, in the face, in the sparkle of the eyes.

Affection is related to thought as the tone of voice to language. So the affection of a man who is speaking is known by his tone, and his thought by his language. Thus, by inference, the will which the affections disclose is known. Not to attribute the affection to the will, would be to confuse affection with understanding. “I wish” is a clue to the affection, as “I think” implies the understanding. The affection for knowing is what prompts us as children from the beginning. Later comes affection for reasoning, hence, the great increase of interest in economics, civic and moral matters. We note, then, that affection prompts understandings all the way along. Thus, affection for seeing truth quickens thought when thought attains a higher level. The same is true of interior meditation.

The process of outward-moving love, in brief, is this: will first embodies love, the affections constitute its form, and then the various consequences disclose the ends which prompted love in its outgoing. Thus, in intellectual matters, the understanding is in a way formed
by love through affections for knowing, and thence for seeing what is known and understood. Love or will conjoins itself to wisdom, not wisdom to love or will. Thus, too, such thoughts as may flow in from the spiritual world are received first by love, according to its affections in the understanding.\textsuperscript{328} It is the affection which keeps thought in its states and in its alliances with faith.\textsuperscript{329}

Affection is both the receiving agent and the efficient principle of the life or conduct following. The affections, being natural or rational, or, of higher types, according to the man, affection is visibly the whole man according to his quality. In fact, it is affection in thought or experience which makes an impression on the memory, since, as we have noted, the principle of explanation is invariably love and its various affections. Without affection to give power for registering impressions, no perception (realization) of its meaning, would follow from the thought or experience. Thus, affection is the means of uniting truth with good so that it may become definite in the conduct following. Some affections are, of course, more interior, the outermost being those that belong to the body, with its appetites and pleasures. But, in any case, the spontaneity of the ensuing activity is from the ardor of affection. A spiritual sphere envelops according to the life of his affections. The dominant affection is present in every minutest aspect of the implied will and thought. Hence, all operations of the mind may be known from the detailed changes of state of the affections. Indeed, the spirit is affection in form, the dominant affection being the “very form itself,” notably when charity and faith are in the ascendant. Man does good from freedom when he does it from affection, and the affection that is of love, is permanently inscribed on the life.\textsuperscript{330} Man’s thought is such that, “while he is intent upon anything, he places that before anything else,”\textsuperscript{331} but what man pursues, he strives for because of some affection in it. All affections with implied interests and successive acts of attention pertain
to the reigning love from which they spring. Thus, if a man loves power acquired through wealth, he will covet money, giving habitual attention to opportunities for gaining it. Thus, a type of love will dominate his life. To know love in its universality, is to understand the prevailing types, hence, to know what they imply about the two worlds.
Chapter 19
Understanding

To know intellect in terms of first principles, is to consider understanding, thought (idea), knowledge, reason and rationality in general. Understanding is primarily the capacity for life from Wisdom, as influx from the Lord. It is a recipient form intimately related to love-will, so that it constitutes the fundamental reality of the human mind, intellectually speaking. Engaged in activity, the understanding is ability to think and speak from thought. The potency is from Wisdom, which has its seat in man in this capacity. But this potency is not separate from will. Understanding, as distinguished for analysis, is described as another degree. But here, as elsewhere, the dynamic principle contributes the profounder basis of knowledge rather than any descriptive differences. Understanding would be nothing without will. Will would have little content or form without understanding.

Will, we have seen, is rich in meaning and values, some of which became clear by considering will as nearly as possible by itself. We note that its activity is implied in all thinking and perceiving. Will relates to what a person loves in the whole range of human interests. Hence, it is involved in all goods, in contrast with special references of understanding to truth. Again, both will and understanding find expression in actual deeds which, by making concrete the good and the true, also make love and wisdom explicit. It is from the understanding that this purposive activity derives the content which determines it in the direction of a deed in the life of service. From truth, such service derives the quality which, in turn, renders it explicit. The whole process
makes clear what was potential in will and understanding as powers which would be devoid of life were there no goods and truths to be made manifest. There would then be sheer opposition or evil. Hence, the force of the statement that goods and truths are “something.”

The marriage of the good with the true is a dynamic expression of union of will and understanding. In every good deed, embodying what man thinks, there is such union. Hence, this marriage enters and is active in producing the effect. Even though there are successive deeds, these embody the same unity of will and thought, for example, in the manifold duties which man performs for his church. The deeds pertain to love or good. The means to these actions relates to understanding or truth. Any deed may thus be analyzed into its elements, the two principles always being regarded in their connection, since neither is real apart from the other.

Will was given to man for the sake of the good, including love; understanding for the sake of truth, including faith. The one communicates in a “wonderful manner” with the other. Man could not have been permitted to sunder these. This would have meant understanding and speaking truth, while willing and doing evil; for the one would have been turned toward heaven, the other toward hell, and man would have been rent in twain by the conflict. The fact to emphasize, is that understanding favors the interest in question when will sweeps in that direction. To know which way the understanding is turning, one must know much more than the actual process involving the goods and truths, also their opposites.

Will is the prime agent in producing motions and understanding in presenting sensations. Action is from will, perceiving and experiencing sensations from understanding. But neither motion, action, conduct, nor receiving, experiencing, and grasping the purport of sense-perceptions is possible without cooperation of will.
When we start from the existence of things in space, with the fact of actual events, such as the coming of night or a snow-storm, we readily conclude that sensations is the first mental product, in contrast with the explanation given in a previous chapter. But starting with life as inner activity, we note, first its expression as love, then the response which thought makes. Moreover, as understanding is derived from Wisdom and influx, its rationality is interior, thus from above, from a heavenly light which illumines the mind with general principles essential to it. The disposing activity is not from the outer world, despite the theory of knowledge advocated in our day. There are strong reasons, then, for following this exposition in precise detail, that the full import of this conception of understanding may be plain.

We observe, for example, that man’s intellectual life, at its best, is from what he believes to be true. Indeed, truths may be the whole of his understanding. The faculty is preserved even when man’s vision is obscured by falsities. The content imbued does not necessarily pass into the will. In fact, understanding could not receive truth unless will receives an equivalent element of good at the same time. Both good and truth are understood differently by one person, as compared with another and, to pervert his powers, would be for man to turn from truth altogether.

There is not only a descent of Wisdom into understanding, but a way of ascent toward heaven. Exterior sensuous things are disclosed in the latter process, then interior sensuous matters, at length what is intellectual: the intellectual principles are projected into sense-experiences, that these may be comprehended. The intellectual element belongs on a higher level in relation to spiritual influx, which contributes the constructive perception. The function of will is to bring to bear requisite goods and truths that man may assimilate them, since otherwise, understanding would be outside of man, will within. Scientific information pertaining to the
outer world is of service in forming the understanding. But once assimilated, these facts constitute an outermost intellectual plane only, on which man no longer thinks.

When his intellect is illumined through affection for truths through the accompanying element of good, man can discern inwardly by spiritual perception. Thus, eventually spiritual life makes the light of the understanding. Intellect, as augmented and growing from infancy to manhood, consists of discernment into facts from experience in terms of causes and effects. Thus, civic and moral patterns are understood. To attain closer relations to influx of light from heaven, is to advance toward intellectual perfection. Man receives intellectually, according to his application of facts, the type of his mental life, and his nature or makeup in general. Understanding is not, then, lacking in anyone who is sane: it is given to man that, through freedom, he may choose between good and evil. Unless intellect, thus ascended, so that man could think and choose, thus act from himself, he could not appropriate what is good and true on the higher level. Spiritual truth and good are received according to the degree of his intellectuality: man must attain adult age before he can be regenerated. One man may excel through perception of what is honorable, just, and good, through elevation of his thought into spiritual light. Another may excel through higher enlightenment because he adopts love to the Lord and charity toward the neighbor. Innumerable considerations then become clear in either case.

Understanding does not rule, unless will so inclines. What is done consciously, is simultaneously from will and understanding, since it is the whole man who acts. This is true even when man acts from falsity and evil, also in instances of guilt due to failure to check an impulse toward evil when evil is seen.
Since scientific information stored in the exterior memory serves internal sight as a “plane of objects,” this “slight” looks into the plane below, chooses and elicits what agrees with the uppermost affections. By thus adapting what is below, the understanding lifts it into its own memory. This is, in general, the source of man’s internal intelligence and wisdom.

The understanding also contains truths from a celestial origin, woven with knowledge from below. Man excels in this interweaving process in proportion as his understanding has been formed from genuine truths. It follows that understanding, at large, is such as the truths that form it, and such as the faith in these principles. Contrariwise, the understanding is such as its falsities, with the credence put in them. Ideally, knowledge of Divine good and truth should precede and enlighten the understanding, that the good and truth may be received by the will. When man, through will, is responsive to good, he is “in the truths” of this good in the understanding. It is invariably unity of will and understanding which gives the efficiency, never activity of understanding apart from functioning love. Even right doctrines would make no headway alone. For the understanding is not like a hopper or mold. There are no “thought-patterns” by which understanding functions, as if its processes were due to biologically acquired habits. Man must give assent. He must believe, or think, to make a truth his own. Each stage of the process is due to affection.

Since appearances first form understanding from external sources, if the misconception lies deep, the mind will not be clarified until it has long been held in spiritual light. There is always an offsetting tendency of natural light to be guarded against. It is easy to “think from the eye,” neglecting the understanding, which is readily closed by this projection from mere things of sense-experience. In his ascent toward higher planes, man passes from degree to degree until
the perfecting of knowledge of the natural world is possible. He proceeds, both by reasons drawn from the knowledge of ordinary experience, and by insight that it is so in case of axiomatic truths.

“When man is in evil, many truths can be introduced into his understanding, and yet not be profaned. The reason is that the understanding does not inflow into the will, but the will into the understanding.” It is through cooperation of will and understanding that man has “life of his own,” even when man is not considering truths. It is the life of will and understanding, taken together, which shows what man is “in each and all things.” Hence, an idea taken tentatively into the understanding, does not pertain to the whole man. Memory is the “soil” of intelligence and wisdom. Understanding is their germinating place. In the will, these qualities fructify. Will and understanding “together,” may be cultivated and perfected without limit. There is a property in the love-element of our nature to which the “burning property of fire corresponds.” This inmost affects the understanding. Hence, the need of clarifying light and quickening heat from spiritual sources, in order that the spiritual plane may be attained.

The Divine is not specifically in our nature in more remote things, certainly not in matters which rarely touch the understanding. Man is in the Lord so far as he lives according to the Divine order. Since man was created a “form of Divine order,” the Lord is in man so far as that order rules. The standard by which intellect is understood in its best estate, then, is the degree to which the Divine order attains in very truths man’s highest region. With a life “contrary to order,” man closes certain regions of his mind. The Lord is, of course, still in or with man, though man is not with the Lord. The true order is for man to be wise from the Word. Then, all else will follow, and man will be enlightened even in matters of lesser rational value.
Since rationality makes understanding possible, much depends on man’s will to be rational, by considering such explanatory details as those before us in this chapter, details which might seem unessential, unless we know both the intimacies of relationship and the contrasts between will and understanding. The understanding, far from being united with will at first, is divided from it in such a way that the union is attained only as an actual achievement which is accomplished when man cooperates with Divine influx. So, we see the more clearly why understanding is subject to will, while will is not subject to understanding. The latter, is indeed, essential, but this is in making explicit what should be done from will, when will has already favored a proposed line of action. Will is even dominant when its incentives are evil, and when understanding finds “reasons” (when man “rationalizes,” we would now say). One who is in bondage to evil desires might even will to extirpate what is spiritual. In that case, the understanding could do nothing less than foster such a motive.

Into union of will with understanding, may enter manifold derivatives of love (affections, desires, appetites, with their pleasures or delights), and manifold derivatives of wisdom (perception, reflection, recollection, thought, intention). The unity is seen in the consent, conclusion, and determination to follow resulting from these. Derivatives are classed according to their closer affinity to the one faculty or the other.

So, in case of the organic forms: each faculty is in first principles in the brain, but the fibers are not the only receptacles. The organic forms as correspondences are not complete, externally speaking. The reasons have already been given: man is a living subject, not a crystallization of substances of the brain; and will and understanding constitute a living endeavor which must be understood to know what each faculty is. Faith, inseparable from love, is often the direct clue to unity. A man might assert that he has faith, but contradict his declaration in
practice, disclosing a different type of love; whereas, true faith is always to love and do. In addition to being well-grounded in first principles, the understanding brings principles to bear to which man gives assent through a faith which welcomes, and a will which acts. Once more obedience is a significant factor, so far as body and mind are concerned. In all these relationships, man is more himself from willing, than from either knowing or doing, the will being the “heart.” The understanding has an advantage only so far as its capacity is concerned to lift its subject-matter into spiritual light.

Only by appearance, then, are will and understanding distinct, because the left hemisphere of the brain is for intellect, the right hemisphere for will. The basis in the brain is always general, while the mental basis is, therefore far more significant. As primary, enduring after death, will, for example, is intelligible in terms of its plane; and thus far not dependent on the brain. The “will of the heart” is not from the flesh. When man is described as corporeal, natural, and rational, the implication is that the corporeal communicates with the understanding in its own manner only, a mode of activity not to be confused with any higher mode. Man’s lower understanding is typical of his lower thought only. Hence, the forms and substances which receive inferior thought are described with closer finality to the “first principles,” or physiological basis.

With the understanding as its basis, thought is obviously as extensive as the intellectual life in its entirety. Capacity to think rationally, as the Lord’s power in man, is in contrast with what man thinks, as due to contacts with the world. Although man cannot define what is Divine in essence, he can define what is finite, and so move progressively toward knowledge of the Lord. Divine truth is meanwhile the final objective. Such truth, grounded in the Divine order, is a living reality which “flows continually with man,” constituting his intellect so that he may think
Apart from this unceasing influx, man would neither be able to perceive nor to understand anything whatever. Man is either in the light of heaven, so that he has spiritual perception, or he derives principles of thought from this light, however far he may be from knowing this central relationship.

It follows from the foregoing that with every man, there is an internal and an external element of thought. The internal, from the energizing love, has its affections and resulting perceptions. The external, from the contents of memory, serves by confirming the love and fostering its expression. Sometimes there is an apparent discrepancy between internal and external because the controlling love is like a censor guarding its expression. Union between the two is best seen when heavenly love is resident in both, so that thought and speech are in perfect unison.

Because man is spirit and can think from the light of the spiritual world, he can see truths. The light which gives this ability is distinct from that of conscience, yet is also related to it, notably in the detection of evils. There is a wide range of differences between thought due to celestial perception, and thoughts devoid of conscience. It always follows that what is interior is man’s “proper thought,” wherein he is “at home.” External thought would be “proper” to him only when expressed in the body. Man (in a sense) thinks of himself. But he lacks even one idea from himself alone. In thinking what seems to be his, he really thinks what flows into his mind, he sees in a sort of mirror, or thinks from others, hereditary evil being another factor. Again, he is far from being alone, intimately related as he is to various spheres. His thought can be with a society in the spiritual world while his speech and actions are among men in the natural world.
Lest this should seem to indicate that thought flits into a ghostly world, we again note that mind is substantial. Physiologically, thought is localized in the cerebrum. On this basis, it proceeds from organic substances. Man cannot, indeed, while in the body, think wholly apart from the principles which the natural mind has acquired.\textsuperscript{351} The light which falls into external ideas, is from the light of the world. Thought is ordinarily immersed in mundane matters, in terms and contrasts due to the world. So, man usually thinks from information gathered by contact with external things. The brain is explicitly the organ wherein “thought comes forth complete and organized in every part.”\textsuperscript{352} Hence, the proposition that the thought of man is “nothing but what is corporeal, and material . . . from material things which constantly adhere,” and in which man’s thoughts are founded and terminated.\textsuperscript{353} The forms or substances which receive the ideas are also material. Man’s ideas are “material” because he has formed them from objects in “grosser nature.” Even thought about material things is terminated in them; where these thoughts are terminated, they appear to be and, thence, man perceives what he thinks.\textsuperscript{354} Man’s first idea being from objects of material sight and from the “material ideas of memory,” the first thoughts could not be otherwise.

Such thought, as “lower,” or “from the eye,” is, of course, from appearances, from natural light, although man can think above it, seeing its process as it were beneath him. Meanwhile, the truth that love is fundamental to thought, precludes any theory that thought is solely produced by the brain. Internal thought so discloses what is external, that the true nature of the external is seen. Since man needs to examine thoughts as well as deeds, the reason for this contrast is plain. Man can even see from internal thought what his will is accomplishing by inferior thought. Even sensuous appearances are instructive.
As thought saves no one, any thought that does not agree with a man’s conduct perishes, while what has been thought and done remains. The smallest particulars of thought, in the interiorly significant sense, are inscribed on the interior memory. Temptations bring new thoughts, hence new opportunities for attendant affections which make thought instrumental, and for the freedom implied in moral choice. Fortunately for man, what he merely thinks and does not do, or does not want to do, remain outside, to be “dissipated like chaff by the slightest wind.” Hence, many obscurities incidental to temptation are purely ephemeral. But thoughts from inward deceits, hatred, and revenge, although obscure, may have entered the will so that they are more influential. Therefore, in other connections, “man is as real as his thoughts are.” So, too, man’s conjunction with the Lord turns upon his thought with its affections. What man thinks may then be profoundly significant.

Lower thought is external because it is in figures or imagery drawn from space and time. Innumerable items, variously united, flow in to make the forms of such thought with its “pictured images.” So, too, the idea of one thing flows into and colors another. Man’s external thought is, indeed, an image and likeness of himself as natural. In so thinking, man contemplates ideas having spiritual correspondences, but of these he is unaware. Therefore, he does not know that they pertain to his interior states.

It is exceedingly difficult to remove the element of space and time from our ideas, that we may think spiritually. There is much that cannot be comprehended until, by Divine enlightenment, the mind is withdrawn from that element. To rise above space and time is not by any means to abstract one’s thought from the present, but to think both from what is present and from what is eternal. The temporal world is really nothing in comparison with the eternal principles which make spiritual thought possible. Man can comprehend many things by aid of a
spiritual idea, with thought therefrom: from spiritual states, not from things; from “states of love” with their affinities and likenesses; and “states of life” expressing what is above the bodily senses.\textsuperscript{359} For spiritual light is admitted into such thought “with the spirit.” Such thought, relatively speaking, is, indeed, abstracted from the body by aid of interior sight. Hence, it is not dependent on sense-imagery of any type.

Some effort is required to make this abstraction. A clue is found in the truth that the love and wisdom, wherewith we interiorly think, are neither in space nor in time, but from the Lord who is above all space and outside of all time. When thinking from love and wisdom, we think from qualities, comparing spiritual with natural goods. The good, we know, is not limited by mere things and events. Again, we are near or remote from people because of spiritual relationships with them, sometimes exceedingly near in spirit when they are hundreds of miles away. Spiritual thought functions according to the form of heaven, or the Divine order. It is less and less analytical as it ascends, hence, less dependent on facts brought consciously into relation, thus it is more intuitive.

Since thought from Divine truth is not from space, it is not limited by time. Thought from interior memory has no times and spaces adjoined to it, although it reflects or proceeds by reference to states which involve progression.\textsuperscript{360} The interior elements of such thoughts are from affections. These two are qualities. We do not measure an affection by its quantity, or dimension. Without interior memory, man could not thus think. As the exterior memory is stored with facts due to external things and events, so the interior must have its imagery.

Whatever pertains essentially to spiritual states of love, life, wisdom, joys, goods, and truths, may be an element of thought in this, its higher form. We may put the matter to the test by considering whether love, or any affection due to it, wisdom or any perception springing from it,
or even thought, as such, seems to be in space and time, or to have space or time in its quality or reality. Our process of thought seems long or short according to its interior relationships. The contrasts in apparent duration are great indeed, as our state varies, for example, when an absorbing insight arises, in contrast with the dully wearisome thought into which the mind occasionally lapses. The apparent duration may oftentimes be directly traced to the affection from which the thought springs. An “affection of gladness” may seem to fill but two hours, when occupying the mind for ten or twelve. Time in relation to a state is then a mere appearance. The sphere of our spiritual states already constitutes a realm for us, in terms of which we may rise to a conception of the spiritual world in general.

Thought referring to persons and their external qualities, to names and words, is less universal. Such thought tends to terminate in external things and to remain therein, as in case of a man identified with a civic occupation. But thought away from the given things in the natural world, and not determined by them may, as universal, be understood spiritually. This is thought without reality. It extends beyond self and the limitations of merely natural ideas. It is the meaning or value of a person in relation to Divine goods and truths which discloses reality. Man is not man from the fact that he can think from natural appearances, but from the fact that he can think what is spiritually true, and will what is spiritually good; and that when he thus thinks and wills, he can look up to the Divine and “perceptibly receive.” This upward look of inward aspiration lifts him into clearer union with Divine influx, hence, progressively out of time and place. When such thought is essentially perceptive, it is the most interior of all thoughts ever existing with man.

Man’s thought is such that, when intent upon a thing, he places that objective before everything else. This is chiefly since his dominant affection is in every item; for, as we have
noted, it is not the element of attention or interest, but the affection which discloses the clue. Thought has its ascent and its descent. The one is from externals to sense-perception, thence, to thought and will, with affections imbuing it. The other is due to influent love or in-shining Wisdom descending into men, there meeting recipient affections which, in turn, influence thought; and, if so willed, influence action. In any event, the reigning love rules. Man’s interest is enlisted in the direction his love takes. What engages love, engages attention. Man must indeed love spiritual thought, to know what it is, and to cultivate it.

Summarizing, we put special emphasis on the teaching that the understanding is fashioned for the incoming and assimilation of Wisdom by heavenly influx; since this gives the intellectual life superiority over deliverances from the external world. This freedom from external relationships is especially seen in “thought with the spirit.” For in such thought, the mind breaks away from subservience to mere facts and considers external principles, laws, truths, and goods. This is the ideal instance of what we have called spirit-function. To envisage thought as lifted into spiritual light, is to sense the beauty of the understanding. Granted this way of picturing the understanding, vividly seeing it with heavenly light flooding its structure, we are prepared for the outward look toward the world. What the understanding brings to the process of knowing nature is more significant than what it receives.
Chapter 20
Correspondences

To see the nature and scope of correspondences within the sphere of man’s mental life, it will be worth our while to make a brief excursion into the larger sphere of the universe. For the idea of a uniform relationship between the great universe and man, the microcosm is a very ancient one, developed by varied means of approach, usually by a method radically unlike that followed by our seer.

In ancient Greece, for example, man’s thought about the cosmos began with uplifted interest toward the visible heavens, with the great world in its widest extent. Not until the nature of things had been envisaged in terms of an original stuff out of which all tangible substances may have been developed did man, as thinker, turn to himself as a little world, somehow encompassed by the vast events of the universe around him. So, too, in other lands where the heavenly bodies were observed in their rotations in such a way that astronomy and astrology arose, man’s subservience to what later became known as the solar system, was of far greater moment than his spiritual position in relation to the mighty forces to which his daily existence is subject. Very much later, scholars became interested in the human events in general, with comparisons between the birth, growth, and decay of a nation, and similar changes in the individual. Then came, in the nineteenth century, theories of evolution of vast numbers of species of plants and animals, with the eventual discovery that the human embryo passes through forms resembling those of lower and higher types of animals. The inference in favor of evolution
has been carried still further by comparison between the mental development of man and the
mentality of the animal world. With each extension of the principle of development, the
conclusion seemed to follow that the external series of events and things explains the inner
series, man being a product of Nature, mind a product of brain, and the inner life an effect of
bodily behavior. Man’s moral nature, even his religious experiences, were construed in the same
way. As man reproduces cultural stages of the race, so his beliefs were said to correspond with
his status in the long march from lower to higher forms. All these conceptions lead eventually to
a theory of the physical cosmos ostensibly the final reason for the relationship between man and
the great system of which he is an exceedingly small part. It is no wonder that the psychological
time-honored ideas of the soul. To see “why man behaves like a human being,” is to realize how readily the biological view has intruded into the
world of psychology. To urge this viewpoint to the limit is to discern, in keenest contrast, the
divergence of the doctrines before us, with their emphasis on the primacy of Love-Wisdom, thus
the primacy of the spiritual sphere in which man lives as a human being because he is a spirit by
virtue of a graduated descent from the Divine.

The approach to correspondences, as universal from the viewpoint of the inner life, was
indeed anticipated in other lands, much more subjective in their thought than the philosophy of
the Greeks. Thus, came into vogue the idea that the visible corresponds to the invisible, the
temporal to the eternal, because the natural world manifests spiritual reality. In India, Spirit was
taken to be First Reality, Nature a realm so subordinate that it was sometimes attributed to
ignorance or illusion. So, in the Occident, wherever idealism appeared, the initial emphasis was
put on Spirit, or its equivalent. It was a logical step to infer that mental states and brain-states
extend in parallel lines, so that the relation between the two series is precise to the limit. It has
become a truism in psychology that some sort of correspondence exists. During Swedenborg’s scientific period, a rationalism of this type was already current in the world.

The difficulty is that, events with their processes in the one series, might be said to move independently of the serial advance in the other, without the slightest causal connection, or the one series (the cerebral) might be said to cause the other sequence; or, again, causal activities might be said to proceed from both sides. In any event, the two series might have been patterned to work together when the universe was laid down (by “pre-established harmony”), or this clock-like relationship may have been a result of evolution without prearrangement of any sort. Who is to decide? Many scholars have now given up the puzzle by assuming that man is “one conscious organism,” by so simplifying the issue that, what is most significant on the mental side, is wholly neglected.

Even before his illumination, Swedenborg became convinced that there is real action of mind on brain. So, his conception of influx, coupled with the growing idea of correspondences, afforded a clue to follow into all fields, alike in the subjective life of man, and in the objective sphere of history, with its intimate relationships. Thus, for the first time in man’s efforts to understand both the macrocosm and the microcosm, the spiritual principle stood out in bold relief, in contrast with all theories based on the primacy of externals. Since all causes in the universe are spiritual, in psychology, the causal relation is on the inner side, any apparent action on the part of the brain being reaction; the life or activity is invariably from within. Hence, the brain is, at best, an instrument, as the preceding chapters have shown, the senses being capable of giving information concerning the outside world but unable to impose deliverances upon the organism. Correspondence with influx is thus radically different in explanatory type from ancient or modern views, slurring over either the differences in degree between mind and body, or the
meaning of the remarkable affinity between the two series of events. In brief, correspondence is possible through a dynamic relationship which is a vital fact in your mental life and in mine. Mind and brain are not “two aspects of one substance.” Their intimate relation is not like that of two clocks wound up to run through all time. Brain does not coerce mind. Mind does not impose itself on brain. Nor can it be truly said that man, as body, is “one conscious organism.” The true conception is impossible unless influx, correspondence, and degrees are discerned in inseparable relation.

This far-reaching insight on Swedenborg’s part was also derived from a comparison between meanings within the text of certain books of the Bible, and the text itself, the outer or literal text bearing the relation of body to soul when put in the light of the Divine truths which it contains. The apparent historical narrative, beginning with what reads like a purely literal account of creation, is interiorly the record of stages of progress of the soul into fullness of reality, amidst a context of ostensibly material events as easily misconstrued as the complexity of man’s mental life. The cause or purpose which led to the selection of the words of the text is to be found in the Word, clothed in correspondences from within-outward. The Word belongs to the open world of spiritual things, while the text is found in the closed world of verbal forms and subject to the same misconception with which the natural man judges all externals, mistaking mind for brain, and brain for mind. As the text contains a complete language of correspondences, so does the text of man’s life. The Word is everywhere the clue, notably as “written in the heart.” It takes form by universal law. Given the insight, we may start at any point in any series.

Thus, in beginning our study of inner states and their affiliates, the principles of relationship between inner and outer was already implied. It seemed more intelligible to start with the evidences than to state the principle, since our study also leads up to the other two
cardinal truths, that of influx and degrees, truths which become clear when we see what are the elements which they integrate. Moreover, it is important to enter progressively into such matters, to be explained as those of the brain, and senses in terms of their spiritual significance because, all about us in our day, prevalent psychologies accent externals so persistently that he who even refers to “soul” or “spirit” seems to be outmoded.

Simply stated, the principle of correspondences hardly needs to be argued. Even the faces of people we meet are “types of love.” From common experience, “we know how faces change and vary according to the love’s affections.” From the face, shine the moods of love . . . both its joys and its grief.”365 We realize that the fidelity, wherewith faces show forth what is within the mind, depends on the state of the spiritual life in its advance toward complete integrity. So we discount faces here and there which tell a tale of masquerading motives, insincerities, and dishonesty, with their relationships in what is now popularly called the subconscious. So, externals make or mar. They make for appearances calculated to mislead. Or, they indicate realities which nobody could deny. Plainly, the guide to correspondences in which the part-to-part relation is not broken, is found in the highest types we know, perfect correspondence being an ideal possibility. So, in our study, even the celestial is sometimes mentioned, that we may think from highest to lowest, possessing an adequate standard.

Wherever we start, then, correspondence in its universality is the appearing of the internal in the external in such a way that, what is spiritual, is represented in the natural or external.366 What is represented or portrayed is not a mere figure of speech, a symbol, or analogy. Correspondence is not a merely quantitative relation, as if we could reduce our inner states to so many units in a measurable scale. That is the device which is being carried to the limit in the laboratories, as if there were no qualities at all. True correspondence is by quality, although
secondarily, there are, indeed, sequences which might be described by reference to units, if we could isolate a single inner state, so hold it fast as it were for inspection. Correspondence by quality (as from facial beauty to spiritual virtue), is as precise a relation as any mathematical articulation could show. But it is relationship by antitheses between interiors and exteriors, for example, between the invisible and the visible, spirit and its ultimates, inmost and outermosts, and through adaptation to appropriate forms and conditions. This relation can be expressed in various ways: as that of cause and effect, priority and what is posterior, the connection of the spiritual with the natural, between substance and its various modes of manifestation in the things dependent on it, and so on, by invariably conforming to the principles of the Divine order in graduated descents from type to type, or plane to plane, each describable by its degree. The readiest approach to universality is in noting that correspondence centers about man in two-foldedness: the relation between his boy and the visible world, and that between his spirit and the spiritual world, especially between what is highest in his nature and heaven, his internal form being an image of heaven.

In detail, we note that interiors of the spirit receive influx from heaven, while exteriors through mind and body correspond to the world of things in space and time, including ordinary social relationships, by which we describe what men are doing in their daily affairs. In terms of the highest insight, all things in nature as Divine creations, both in general and in particular, are outermost images of celestial and spiritual realities. All natural beings subsist from what is Divine by this principle: the forms of things in nature correspond to forms taken on creatively by Divine influx. Hence, even the phenomena of nature are “living appearances” from the light of Life itself. Hence, it is not by a blending of substances, forces, or forms. Correspondence is best
regarded by comparing types and planes in a scale as products of influx: the creative Life
descends, or is carried over into other forms, but the substances and forms are not transmitted.

As already indicated, there is a difference between external expressions caused by the
inner states in process at the time, and the relationship between inner and outer, in which a
correspondential meaning is seen. Even a dishonest face displays changes caused by rampant
dishonesties within. Every psychology appeals to the cause-and-effect relation. Inner states
bespeaking intimate thoughts and interests, might beam forth on the face, the more interior states
being manifested through the eyes. Inner states might then act as one with the outward changes.
Thus, what a man is thinking and willing, might be represented before us in remarkable degree.
This would be especially true of his affections. The more central the state, the more illuminating
the clue. So, we might even judge in an approximately righteous way concerning his prevailing
love. But the states, in terms of their meaning, might not “act as one” with what the face
involuntarily shows forth. Correspondence is discernible by interpretation. The bare facts in
many instances might be far from intelligible.

Plainly, internal states are not exactly like their bodily expression, any more than the
emotion of shame is identical with the blush on the cheek which gives the signal of its coming
and going. Internal states are effigied in facial and other modes of expression more delicately and
faithfully in some people than in others. Relationship between states and portrayals may or may
not signify agreement. A “house divided against itself” might, indeed, be manifest in
impressively realistic details—for those who have spiritual eyes. But the facts might be meager,
the doctrinal picture elaborate and profoundly significant.

The causal relation has already come before us so that we are not likely to refer to any
bodily state as if it caused a mental one. But, as psychologists, we are also called upon to
describe appearances in order to avoid confusion with other theories, especially theories of the emotions. An emotion of anger might seem to follow instead of preceding the clenching of the fists and the sudden changes in intonation or manner which accompany this mental state. The individual feeling embarrassment or anger may be scarcely aware of his emotion until he finds his body doing something to manifest or conceal it. Yet, the bodily change is always an effect which could not have come about apart from a cause, as in instances when a sinister expression is displaced by kindness, or when astonishment is made manifest by a gesture. We seldom stop to “count ten” before articulating our wrath. But, psychologically, the tale could be made complete even when body seems to “behave” before mind even momentarily meditates.

Many of our behavior-acts become the more intelligible when discerned by the purposes to which they are due. Thus, a person attains an end by showing forth, in bodily expression, what he loves and thus wills. Again, we note random behavior implying disorganized motives. A given effect, such as the embodiment of hatred or anger, does not continue unless the cause keeps up as we notice when a person, misled for the moment by a rumor, immediately relaxes when the false report is denied. A cause may be constantly in an effect even when one is unaware of any sustained action essential to it. The influence of a cause, with the motive or purpose which guides it, is clearly seen in a ruling passion which imbibes a man’s whole conduct for better or worse, perhaps for years. Our chief interest lies, indeed, in prevailing types of affection urging men to achieve their ends.

Our mental and bodily states might often seem to run parallel, so that neither the clenched fist, nor the emotion of anger, could be regarded as the cause. Indeed, many people behave at times as if they were actual automatons, as dependent on things merely seen and heard as the observer at a picture-play depends upon the flitting scenes before him, unable to move a muscle
to change the sequences, or to think a thought to interfere when he disagrees with what is portrayed. Reactivity of body on mind might seem to be so habitually a causal relation that the type would be a toothache making many night hours miserable, sleep being as impossible as controlled thought. But we never think aright until, starting with the inter-related series of processes, we begin with the truth of causality from within, although we are far from discerning by inspection all the factors, surely far from sensing the influent life from the mental side which makes causal efficiency possible. Not even the body is an “automaton.” No fact, however simple, is capable of being mechanically explained.

To make the efficient relation unmistakably clear, we repeat that action by correspondence, is unlike action by continuity. For, in the latter case, there would be uninterrupted blending. Tourists who have visited Switzerland will recall an instance of blending, outside of Geneva, where a muddy river from one source flows into a remarkably clear one from another source, a mingled product being the result. If we took such blending to be characteristic of mind and brain, the “stream of thought,” as it has been called, mingled with the brain-stream, our ideas would be replete with confusion between instrumentalities utterly unlike.

There is, indeed, an inflow from spirit to mind, and from mind to brain. But our descriptions stop with the given degree, with mind, or body. The conditions and processes on the physical side are totally different from those which cause them, as dissimilar as (1) the angered behavior of the man who vents his wrath upon an adversary when, compared with (2) the sequence of ideas amidst which, impulsively concluding that he has been wronged, he contemplates his thought for a moment, yields to his impulse, then launches the impetus which becomes his undoing. We would describe each phase of a man’s embodied wrath as motion in
space. But how different the mental deed—out of space in the wonderful world which we call the inner life—to which the embodied wrath corresponds.

Wrath may, indeed, be active simultaneously with angered bodily behavior; for none of us can detect the swift flash of thought which sets off a decision and finds instant realization amidst a complexity of habits. Mind and body may, to this extent, move as one. In fact, no one ever feels a “cause” by itself. The experience of an effect may have all the appearance of a cause. But all we can say is that we are aware of mind-body (psychophysical) processes. Insight discloses radical distinctions where all appears mere blending. The bodily state is subordinate to, and obeys the higher, or internal state. The body could not devise and develop anger-reactions of its own accord. Each notion, each habit, every impulse entering the complex response has been acquired. The functioning life is spiritual, even when life seems to be a merely mechanical assemblage of processes of nutrition, wear and tear, and decay of tissues.

Correspondence is relationship between (1) idea and its expression in language, by the face, by gestures, and other means of conveying meaning; (2) feeling, and the attitudes which manifest pleasure or pain, warmth or coldness of emotion, or otherwise disclose personal sentiments; (3) will, intention, motive, purpose, and the external deeds, motions, or characteristic modes of behavior which embody volition; (4), love and its warmth or heat, and the evidences of affection made externally manifest; and (5) in general, the relation between mental attitudes and their expression. In each case, there is a difference between outflow from thought and will, and speech by means of the vocal organs, or actions of the body at large, which express thought and will. The fact of the difference between internal process and external embodiment is of as much moment as unity of meaning between one group of states and another.
The relation of contrast between mind and body is understood in the light of the communication between them. The situation we are under when investigating the relationship, may be compared to the relation between the spiritual world at large, and the world of nature. We see, touch, or otherwise encounter effects in nature, such as the changes wrought through the coming of spring, and with the putting forth of vegetation. The causes, the life, or energy we do not see, we never experience or feel these as such. To take account of them, we must depend solely on our knowledge. Thus, we witness the phenomena of light, but never observe vibrations in the ether through which light becomes manifest. Granted the knowledge of causes, we endeavor to penetrate as far back as thought can carry us. We class causes as prior, effects as posterior. So, we may envisage the human spirit as, at once, interior to the body, and prior to it, as the source of states causing bodily changes, some of which are made vivid and tangible before us. The terms “prior” and “posterior” may well afford the clue to be followed throughout, the one pertaining to the invisible world of causes, the other, to the tangible world of effects. Correspondence is the principle of action between these two, such that mind and body function as if one, though never “one organism,” as the term is used in our day to designate mind and body by stressing body as behaving mechanism.

There is, indeed, a relationship of correspondence within the invisible world, from Divine to celestial, celestial to spiritual, thence to the natural and to the outermost plane of things in the tangible world. But, at present, we are concerned with mind and body as our primary interest. Given a conception of the process by which mind moves the eye to see, the ear to hear, and mouth and tongue to aid when we speak, we are prepared for the more interior correspondence of function and meaning, between action of will and operation of heart, and between understanding and the lungs. The pulsations of the heart and the breathing of the lungs are typical of the internal
processes of will and understanding. Further, there is a correspondence in detail between will and the right half of the brain, and between understanding and the left half.

As heart and lungs are essential to all bodily functions, so will and understanding centralize all mental processes. This is not only a principle of explanation, so that we may, as it were, visualize the operation of will and understanding in making motives and thoughts manifest; it is also a descriptive principle. Thus, heat, corresponding to will, pertains to love, also to righteousness, and to an entire sphere of actions expressive of human motives; while light, corresponding to understanding, thus to wisdom, relates to judgment, and so to other phases of the intellectual life.

This twofold relation exemplified by heat and light continues through mental life with functions which we may bring vividly before us by taking our descriptive clue from corresponding functions of heart and lungs. The spiritual activity, such as wisdom, seeking to make itself known in the world, “fits itself to use as its end.” Its purpose, being to make itself effective in human deeds, wisdom utilizes mental functions as instruments which, in turn, find embodiment in deeds applying wisdom to practical affairs. The external form—say a wise act for the benefit of a person in distress through lack of support in sustaining a family—is subservient to the end which called it into being. In this external “form” (by reference to the law of correspondence) is seen cause, end, and use as spiritual. In contrast with concrete matters thus brought into relation, things which regarded item by item would have no meaning, are full of meaning through this “form.” The human spirit is, in brief, the formative power which brings external operations into accord, so that they embody a purpose. It is brought into conjunction with the body through activities of will and understanding which find their correspondence in the operations of heart and lungs. The relation is so intimate, that will and understanding have a
pulse and respiration which move into the pulse and respiration of the bodily organs.\textsuperscript{368} The two pairs of motion are essential to the life which functions through them. Granted perfect correspondence between mind and body, there is perfect unison in detail between these motions.\textsuperscript{369}

Since the external is always a sign of the internal, whatever is disclosed outwardly, is a means of knowledge of whatever is functioning inwardly, as surely as in the obvious instances of the man who impulsively strikes a blow because he has responded to an impetus to be angry. Inferences from effects to causes are here warranted because we possess the principle which universally applies to every element of man’s nature. Wherever there is union of things differing in state, quality, degree, this is the basis of their relation. The profoundest instance is in the conjunction of man with the Lord.

Again, this is the relation between our present existence in the world of time, which we measure by reference to seasons, months, days, and hours; and the future life, which we distinguish by states of spirit wherein time plays no part. Since man already bears within him the three degrees which relate him to celestial and spiritual realities of the future, as well as to the intellectual matters of the present life, and external events which occur with temporal precision, he possesses the basis of all these relationships through which he corresponds to the total universe. Thus, we may study the mental life, not merely in its resemblances to external things, but also in the light of the internal qualities which he puts on us rapidly as his spirit comes into accord with the Divine order. Thus, man’s existence is literally in two worlds at once according to the same principle as that between interiors and exteriors. To carry out this principle in detail would also be to trace this intimacy of relation between man’s whole nature and the mineral,
vegetable, and animal kingdoms; between the physical body and existence in the spiritual world; and between man’s spirit and the societies of that world.

Since correspondence is the universal principle of relationships, all communication is intelligible by relation to it; and man’s existence not only corresponds in a completely general way, but there is not the smallest part of him which does not correspond, so that he exists and subsists by this means. Every law, condition, and process is thus to be understood. Here, in very truths, is the basis of the Divine order. The special psychological significance of this principle is that (1) all causality from spirit to body is on this basis; (2) all expression or manifestation is from within-outward; and (3) this is the principle of comparison between all types of inner states and bodily behavior, notably with reference to spiritual influx, inseparable from it.
Since correspondence as a universal principle is dynamic, it involves causality in the truest sense of the word. The clue to this causal relation is influx. The primary fact in tracing the affinity between soul and body is not, then, the mere precision of states and conditions which “correspond” so that inner states are portrayed in the body, but the fact that what is vitally thought and willed is vividly carried out in bodily expressions in which inner motives reside. The crucial point is that this relation is by correspondence, not by continuity, as we might infer from influx alone, neglecting essential differences between soul and body. We bear in mind, therefore, in following this doctrine in its development, the fact that our seer, in his scientific period, had examined and rejected various views of the connection between soul and body in favor of the principle of degrees, in contrast with views involving the idea of an unexplained blending of substances somewhere within the brain.

To see the force of this teaching, that all efficiency is by influx instead of by continuity, we start with the idea of God as Source of all life, power, and energy in the universe; with the proceeding forth of Spirit as universally creative; while the universe, in whole, and part, is envisaged as each moment dependent on this sustaining Presence. The outermost result is as directly dependent on the imbuing Spirit as the initial stage of manifestation. So is the transition from plane to plane in all kingdoms of nature, notably in case of what is most distinctly visible and tangible in star or planet, rock or tree. Influx is the universal law of operation by which
Divine life enters all created forms. As universal, it includes the other two fundamental principles: the relation of spiritual things to natural by correspondence, and the relation of planes of existence and manifestation by distinct degrees, in ordered genus and species, types, purposes and uses.

God as infinite and transcendent is above space and time. Nature is so far separate from creative Life that God does not mingle with it, although omnipresent as “within” all space and “within” all time. As “without” space and time, there is in Him nothing proper to the world, because He is a different degree. The beginnings of all things are from Him, all things are present in Him, and one thing is formed from another by his power in them, yet God remains outside. The created universe manifests God, and so all created things have their place in relation to Him. But the order of descent and subsequent ascent, from plane to plane, is by inflowing power such that the activities of each level are distinct.

Thus, the influx of life from the Lord into the inmost of man’s spirit is higher in significance and effect than any other influx active on earth. From this influent life comes, in turn, as we have seen, the influx into mind, distinguished as will and understanding because of the imbuing Love and Wisdom which makes these faculties distinct. Hence, in turn, comes affections and thoughts to give details and special meanings; the influx of will into actions and speech; and the activity of the senses and organism in general, so that the body likewise lives from influx, although radically unlike the spirit which it serves.

There is also an influx from Spirit into the spiritual world at large, from the spiritual into the natural, thence into physical bodies. Thus, influx has its bodily basis and nature. All influx is from Divine life, but because according to order everywhere it has receptacles which distinguish
its types; hence, the differences between the receptacles and their modes of responses are significant.

The law of influx is that of Divine efficiency in all things. To realize this truth is to see why all things depend on the Lord for their being. The actual term “influx” is psychological, derived from the well-known saying that soul “flows” into body. It is also used because, as essentially spiritual influx, it may be understood by appeal to correspondences, hence, as like the inflow of blood into the heart. Furthermore, man is led by an influent process according to subsistence from this Life, with entire dependence on its pulsations from moment to moment.

Entering the inmost of the spirit, influx descends to lesser forms by vivifying each according to response. So, it may meet forms not in correspondence with it. Its order is, by priority, into will, before understanding (thence into the rational plane in general), from which it proceeds to the outer sphere of mind into the sense-organs. Influx into interiors, with an inherent tendency to proceed forth, is essential, not only to man’s being, but to the activity of all faculties and senses; it is therefore incessant. Man’s freedom is due to it. Without it, man would be devoid of both goods and truths. Hence, the influent Life is to be recognized as at once the basis of man’s being, and of the principles or qualities which give significance to it, which impart impulses toward spiritual progress. In this sense, influx tends to dispose man’s whole selfhood according to Divine order.

Yet, as man’s whole existence is due to influx, and as responses vary with the individual, influx is more nearly apparent in activities we all know than in the hidden spiritual activity on which our being constantly depends. Moreover, general influx from the world, meeting that from within, also enters the account. So, there may be impressive connections between what the world brings and produces, and what we tend to be as spiritual beings. The spirit may be far less
responsive than the well-formed body with which it is clothed. Or, the spirit may be beautiful though residing in a body far from beautiful. What is sensuous in man, admits influences from the world of a like nature. What is spiritual in our nature, admits what is spiritual. Hence, we distinguish between internal and external recipient forms, noting the fact that influx flows into receptacles, not in order; while the general influx on which man’s life depends is always from the spiritual order of reality.

In other words, all experience is due to influx. Experience, as we already know, and whether we rightly interpret it or not, is complex. There must be uninterrupted flow of life to make experience possible at all. According to the law of influx this is the basis on which our mentality depends in leasts and greatest, whatever we think, do, or say; whether we welcome or oppose influx, and by opposing close an inner door. But every other factor influencing us is by influx also; influences which we classify as physical or social, natural or moral without for the time being considering the mental aspects of our existence. There is not a moment or an incident, superficial or profound, which does not manifest the presence of influx of some sort. Consequently, we discriminate between influx from within which tends to make us perfect in spirit, mind, body, in social conduct, and in external behavior; and influx which less directly comes from nature and social spheres in near-by relation to us. Influences of the latter types sometimes affect and sometimes oppose spiritual inflow. External influx takes from our whole mentality, including our inheritances, some of which are unfavorable. We need something keener than any analysis of this complexity coming from outside: instruction to show us the several sources of the general and particular.

Influx in the most immediate sense is, we have seen, into man as spirit, into will, thence from will to understanding. As appealing to man in inmost degree, this influx is the source of his
finest promptings, of the life which opens interiors from within and above, guiding him into the
good and the true. But any influence which may come to man from spiritual beings in the flesh,
or from the spiritual world, is relational (mediate). Thus, the world affects man from below and
in an external way: worldly influences have no access to man by the direct or immediate way.
Influences from either world, from man in any state of mind or spirit, are mediate (indirect)
because, for one thing, they touch or win by appeal to particulars of mind or character, each of
which is susceptible to psychological analysis. An infernal influence must find its likes, its
responses in the falsities of evil, and the insanities and fantasies which constitute a man’s hell in
order to find lodgment. Where there are no hatreds, revenges, insanities, or desires of an evil
type, there can be no such relationship. A lower influx is forcible. It insinuates its spells or
enticements. It is the opposite of freedom and tends to enter by the subtest way, appealing first
to the love of evil, thence to attendant affections, and through these, into falsities, by which evil
is confirmed in thought and will. But the mere tendency or persistence of the influx is not
enough. It must meet its kindred or suffer a rebuff. Thus, knowledge of, which invite
corresponding influences, is a safeguard against lower influx, while knowledge of what is
favorable to goods and truths, guides man to realization of the way in which desirable influx
becomes effective.

Influx is received according to the recipient forms and states constituting our nature. We may infer the mode of recipiency into spirit from the fact that this influx first touches
interiors of the will. Thus, it touches whatever good is in us before it affects the understanding.
Therefore, in studying will and love, we were considering which receive influx, the superior
particulars. This influx into man’s inmost tends to keep and to instill the perfect unison of love
and wisdom from which it comes. The result of perfect response would be complete harmony of will and understanding in man, the most direct source of unity in his whole experience.

So, too, spiritual sight is from influx received in pristine purity, its tendency being not only to imbue the heart with the purest motives, but to enlighten the understanding with the highest truths. Here, also, is to be discerned the inner dictate which guides the way to the greatest occupations of man. The inmost belongs to the Lord alone. There, the Lord stores goods and truths with which man is gifted from infancy. Through these, man is quickened to become more rational, that he may be enabled truly to think, and truly to be a man. Yet, even here, influx begins to adapt itself to efflux. That is to say, the inflow, dividing into will and understanding with their particulars, proceeds through mind in general, to external deeds. The influx may be impeded by closed interiors, or by such an obstacle as acceptance of adverse doctrine, to the neglect of those good works through which true doctrine is made practical on the outermost plane.

The influx which, immediate on its Divine side as Love-Wisdom, as celestial-spiritual, as goods and truths in inseparable relations, is twofold on the human side. Hence, it is more directly celestial in the former than in the latter, has more of the nature of good in the one than in the other. In the flood-tide of response to this influx, goods and truths would, of course, be accompanied by highly illumined perception. But this is mostly the ideal. This interior perception is possible when there is both love toward the Lord and charity toward the neighbor in large measure. Thus, the first recipient condition turns upon man’s inmost state with respect to the highest type of love. If, however, there is not yet a dictate concerning the highest goods and truths, there may be a lesser response classed as spiritual.
The recipient forms are active on man’s rational plane in so far as the life which inflows can dispose these forms to receive it, a statement which becomes clear when we study the rational plane. Conscience, too, is a recipient form, and subsequent expression of the incoming deeds in appropriate forms of service depends on the response of conscience, the measure in which Divine good finds termination in it, and the degree of its openness; for all responses are by degrees, not by continuous life or energy. The Divine inflow does not descend like a river which rushes upon a helpless channel, sweeping all obstacles in its path. The terms used in describing influx are not to be taken too literally. Influx is partly figurative, with the qualification that its continued course varies with the forms and substances which it utilizes, notably in case of conscience, beset as it is by a complexity of influences.

Influx into will is the power to shun evils, into understanding with ability to think what is true, and to eradicate falsities which support evils. But man is not compelled to renounce his evils. Nor is he compelled to respond to affections that disclose truth to the understanding. Influx is not only according to the quality of forms as relatively constant faculties, but according to variations of the experiences set up in them. It is a universal law that influx accommodates itself to the efflux in process.

Although unaware of immediate influx, man is aware of his current experiences, thus, in a measure, conscious of what he is thinking and doing. Granted knowledge that his interiors receive heaven, his exteriors, the world, so that he may face towards either heaven or hell, he has sure means of discrimination between influx and efflux (expression). No argument is required to prove that man must give more to receive more.

Again, we may be guided by knowledge of what influx brings from within and above. It contributes the prompting toward good which pertains to love. It also gives the spiritual light
which illumines the way to truth. As we can turn either toward the Lord or toward self, the response must be as we turn in case of either goods or truths. Man is made active by influx, and wherever there is activity, something is in process in one direction or another. We never serve two masters in our interiors, whatever our pretensions on the outside. Influx brings freedom both to think and to do good. It is not necessary to cast about as if trying by experiment to discover the true order of being. For, the very nature of influx is both to dispose our selfhood, according to the Divine order, and to enable us to think and understand by that order. The fact that influx from within and above is *ordinate* (order-bringing and order-restoring), is a cardinal principle. Yet, with emphasis on what influx brings, and what influx tends to accomplish, there must be recognition of the fact that man turns as he loves, then turns as he understands, sometimes ready to be ruled, sometimes opposing, almost cursing the hand that would bless him.

Influx in its purity abounds in every blessing man could ask for. It comes both to renew charity and faith essential to rightness of life, and to withhold man from any evil which might mar perception or impede will. It stirs within forms and substances of his nature so that these appear to live from themselves. It brings vivifying forces essential to regeneration. It not only disposes his selfhood for receiving heaven by governing what is most external from what is inmost, but holds all principles in connection. Yet, this is the inner half of the story. The tale that is told of man’s existence in contact with the world is to be regarded in the light of antithetical responses, sometimes a response of sheer hostility, when perchance man prefers a hell of self-love.

We also note why influx sometimes fails to come when anticipated. Man’s internal nature is closed from birth, and some vivifying experience must occur to open it. Man is born in ignorance and must be enlightened concerning principles and truths which pertain to the Divine
order. In so far as he lives according to the laws of that order, his internal nature is opened. Although created into the Divine image and likeness, this is a potentiality, or ideal. The order or image of heaven must be formed in him anew, so far as by heredity and life, he has departed from it. Creation as an idea is distinguished from natural birth as a fact. Man has turned interiors away from heaven toward the world and self. He has acquired forms which turn even the Divine life into contrary channels, so far as his mental experiences are concerned. Fear, for instance, closes the internal of man’s thought (from above) against influx from heaven in manifold ways. So heaven is not admitted. Man receives life intended to lift him above himself as his very own, arrogating power to himself through pride, ambition, and envy. He perverts both goods and truths. He adopts negative attitudes: it is a law that good cannot flow into what is negative nor into doubt.

Any state which opposes Divine influx is negative. All favoring states are affirmative. Falsities and evils break the connection, perverting, deflecting, or suffocating the incoming activity. Interiors are not then reduced to correspondence. Efflux is prevented. Consequences depend on obstacles met at any point. Nothing can do what is evil to Divine Life, but inflow can be impeded. The life-process can be inverted. Man can confirm himself in his inversions. Thus, in various ways, a negative attitude ensues. The subtlest inversion is that which man takes credit for power only derivatively his. He may block his interiors by his attitude of will, even when his understanding is not yet involved. But presently, the will in its infatuation with falsities is so influential, that the understanding becomes closed to truths pertaining to faith. Man, then thinks in a certain way, however his mouth may speak. The internal is always decisive. In the interiors of man, the spiritual and natural worlds are so closely connected that they cannot by any means be separated. This being so, some factor must be uppermost, some
element ruling; what rules at heart, rules in other respects. Thus, a man may be so opinionated in allegiance to a dogma that he is set against enlightenment concerning the true nature of the Lord.

While the question of evil does not enter at this point, we take note of those states of separateness by which man sets himself in opposition to influx; for it is impossible to understand the types of influx without knowledge of qualities which constitute the types. If, for the moment, qualifications seem so numerous, that we have lost sight of pure influx amid the complex situations of daily life, we may remark that human experience is equally complex on any other view. With increase of knowledge, life always seems more complex at first. Yet through the manifoldness of life’s situations, there is always the same system, with the same contrasts repeated; the contrast of two streams meeting two loves which compete for mastery, two possible attitudes with two kinds of consequences coming.
That correspondence, as a principle of description, is applicable to the personal states which you and I feel as life moves on in and around us from hour to hour, becomes plain when we compare changes in facial expression with what is occurring within us. The blush on the cheek may be unintentional. Tears may come to the eyes when we did not mean to weep. But the relationship is there. The better acquainted we are with people, the closer are the correspondences which we notice between what appears on the surface, and what we know is in process within them. Facial changes, swiftly coming and going, may apparently conceal more than they disclose. But even those that are least significant belong in the picture.

Inevitably, we associate personal deeds with the motives or values behind them. So, almost insensibly, we pass moral judgments concerning deeds taken to be right or wrong. We may not mention to others the ethical or religious principles that are at state, but we feel and think by them. The passing event of the moment may be brief, indeed, as an act. But the personal life to which it corresponds, may involve an individual’s whole history. By contrast, a misdeed suggests the virtue which was neglected or denied when it was committed. Each deed, good or bad, has its context. Complete correspondences would be traceable if we could discern the whole relationship, passing from mere occurrences to the truths which heavenly doctrine enables us to supply.
For purposes of convenience in conferring with one another, we make abstractions, now mentioning motives only, or mere deeds; now the passing mental states, which psychology describes, again the moral reasoning which enables us to apply great truths to the deeds of the moment. We are concerned with more than these abstractions imply; we are concerned with the same realities in their integrity, whether mentioned or not. So, correspondences are intimately related with influx, and influx involves the principle which is next to come before us in this study of the inner life. Since our inner states are always in process, as surely as a river flows on, never for a moment still, the fact of influx is most intimately known to us by experience, and influx most readily suggests efficiency. Yet, we are also aware all through the day of contrasts between the inner life, with its values for which we are striving, and the body as an instrument of expression, so different in type from the soul. The body may even seem “carnal,” the soul akin to the angels, radically unlike the body both in quality and in degree. By implication, we are already in possession of a principle of explanation in every way as vitally significant as that of influx or correspondence.

Our study shows us that direct influx proceeds with constancy into what is inmost, so that the inmost is in a highly significant way prominent in the whole inner life, granting us all the privileges of our existence in relationship with the Lord. But there is also a tendency in this, our inner nature, in its entirety toward the outermost. We lock both within and without, therefore, in quest of the complete relationship. Influx from one viewpoint is invariably from within. But influx from the world is invariably external toward what is internal. Man is equipped to meet both streams of activity. In his inmost selfhood, there is a decisive factor, an attitude of love which rules. So, we may for the time being, give heed to what is keenly effective in the outflow from motives to deeds. But the principle of correspondence also supplies the linkages in the
rebound from deeds to inner consequences. While the doctrine of influx puts before us the principle of efficiency, it is the doctrine of degrees which enables us to put the types of activity into characteristic relation.

Our thought is first directed, then, to the teaching that there is a graduated descent from plane to plane, as the Divine life proceeds in creative activity. Each plane is distinguished from those above and below as a degree by the measure and quality of its reception of this life. The reasons for the differences all through the scale are found in the Divine nature. Although the universe as created by the Lord could have been created only in and through Him, yet it is not continuous from Him. For the Lord is Divine Essence itself and, in created things, there can be no Essence in itself. What is continuous from God would be God. The truth is that the universe, as the Lord’s image, is a recipient of Life from Him, not by continuity, but by contiguity, which may be described as nextness, without interfusion or blending. In other words, Life does not exist and produce from itself in a continuous process, but always in order and series. Each order or type is actively manifested so that conjunction, according to the purpose fulfilled, is possible. Taken together, the degrees of Life thus going forth are to be envisaged as a series of descents, each step being a plane above the next succeeding step, till that which is lowest or outermost is attained. In all these stages of descent, Life is influentially present as the sole efficiency, but never by mingling one plane, type, or degree with another: the distinctiveness is not lost, the characteristic qualities are not submerged into their background.

Given this picture of the graduated descent in its integrity, we are ready to gain the other picture of the ascent, from lowest to highest. In general, there are six degrees of ascent to the Lord, three in the natural world, beginning with the body, thus with the outermost, and so with natural-mindedness; and three in the spiritual world. Man receives life on all these levels, and he
can be elevated above his natural estate through the three degrees of his relationship to the spiritual world. To understand what these planes of difference or distinction mean, we must distinguish between discrete and continuous degrees.

By continuous degrees, a thing may gradually lessen or decrease on its own plane, for example, from what is denser to what is rarer. This process of change may be compared to gradations of heat and cold, or light and shade. Thus, in ordinary speech, we contrast the gross with the fine when speaking of the same sort of stuff. This is the common use of the term degrees. But when we compare things radically different, we pass from what is material to what, as spiritual, is wholly unlike in quality, for example, love toward the Lord and the neighbor. So, we appeal to discrete degrees as a principle.

A Divine purpose in creation is prior to the thing created, which exemplifies this purpose in the work accomplished. Thus, the Divine cause differs from the effect achieved as its counterpart. This cause is discretely different from its effect, also separate from it. But the thing created, such as an oak tree, can produce after its kind on its own plane by continuous degrees. Man, as an animal, differs in degrees of height from the oak, as a tree belonging to a kingdom of nature other than that of the human species. Man is a discrete degree different from the oak.

The great contrast is between spiritual and natural. Unless we take this discreteness into account, we cannot know how man differs from other animals. If we judged by continuous degrees we would only be dealing with effects. But, by considering causes, we are concerned with what is discretely different. Thereupon, we note those qualities and powers within man, notably his spirit, which distinguish him from all animals below the human level. Man has within his nature those planes of intelligence which enable him to know the realities of the universe, as distinguished from one another plane by plane, or degree by degree. Man’s mind exists by
heights. He possesses types or kinds of knowledge, for example, wisdom from Divine truth, in contrast with remembered knowledge from nature. Man needs to ascend to the height from which spiritual perception is possible, in order to discern the differences between knowledge derived from within or above, and knowledge from without by sense-perception. Given the descent of Divine truth into his spirit with the resulting perception primarily due to such truth, another type of knowledge of the soul becomes possible; knowledge of the workings of the mind from activities of the spirit, whereas ordinary psychology is based on the lower degree, and does not ascend to the higher.

This transition, from the natural degree to the spiritual, is much more than a step from nerves, fibers, and muscles to the will, which functions through mind, in general, and achieves ends through overt behavior. For the will, quickened as it is from within by love, as we have noted in a previous chapter, is essentially different from the bodily process through which it operates. The will conjoins itself, indeed, with bodily behavior. But will does not itself become those lower mental activities. Things which have nothing in common can yet coexist and be conjoined by discrete degrees. Thus, the term conjunction has a highly significant meaning. It is an illuminating clue throughout. It is sharply contrasted with “union,” so far as the latter term is taken to imply blending or shading off, as one color gradually gives place to another in the spectrum. Functions in man can be conjoined without being united. Man is capable of being conjoined with the Lord. But such relationship never means union, as understood by mystics, who hope to be merged in Deity through contemplation. The discrete differences which characterize man as a created being continue to be true concerning him, despite any apparent transcending of relations. To rise from plane to plane, is not to change the planes which were experienced below. The differences are never lost, as if all that is relative were to become a bare
unity in the absolute. The supreme instance of this preservation of essential differences is in the relationship of the Lord to man. Almost as important for clarity of thought is the enduring contrast between spirit and body.

The relationship of the spiritual world to the natural is the noteworthy instance of inclusion in one universe of spheres that are different, the one above space and time, the other conditioned by space and time. The natural plane is lower, hence, the differences in degree between everything in it and everything in the spiritual world. Within the natural world there are distinctive planes or kingdoms, a statement which is very important in connection with all thought about nature based on the idea of creation of types or species, in contrast with evolutionary theories if species have “emerged” from species by insensible changes. To regard all these matters in terms of gradational descent from above is very different from trying to envisage them with reference to an assumed “spontaneous” emergence from below, as if differences were like contrasts in vibration. For created differences are differences in quality, not in quantity. Quality is produced from above. It is not an emergent product from below.‡‡

So, too, in the spiritual world, there are three heavens differentiating the superior region of that world, the heavens being distinctly different from the types of human states classified as the three hells. The descent from spiritual things through influx is invariably by contiguity, thus by correspondence, as each branch of our subject has shown when followed through to its sources. Things that are contiguous can be as close as the mind is near the brain. But what is near

‡‡ Physical evolution may be real, but it came after spiritual involution which both controlled and modified it. For Dresser, evolution was God’s method of creation, a power and a process that he shared with his creatures once they had progressed sufficiently in intelligence and reasoning to constitute a single Intelligence. The dynamics of human evolution were different from the lower orders whose lives were natural, impersonal, unreflective, and unconscious. Theirs was a veritable struggle for existence, where nature progressed through the survival of the strong and the destruction of the weak. By contrast, humans had supplanted strict biological evolution with mental evolution in which advancement came through actions aimed at blunting the brutish aspects of life’s struggles.
remains within its type, despite the influx from the one to the other, as in the mental activity which finds its counterpart in the behavior of the body.

Since the creative Life does not become anything it produces, nature does not and could not set up an independent existence, forgetting as it were its origin. Life imbues nature universally, while remaining as distinct from created products in the lowest types as in the highest. The Lord is discretely different at all points. In man, spirit is thus discretely different in each typical relationship with the body. This does not mean that spirit is in a degree, as if there were a wall between, with nothing passing over and nothing going through. Spirit is a degree, with its plane, its qualities or powers and the activities peculiar to it, a plane which has never evolved from bodily forces, or processes. Body is a degree, with its processes and operations, dependent (as spirit is not) on such organic processes as nutrition. Spirit is not literally “on” a plane, as if a plane were like the top of a table. Concepts derived from space are misleading when we visualize by material relations. The degree of spirit is a plane, and to realize what this means is always to begin, as indicated in the preceding chapters, with Love and Wisdom as Divine essences. The term “plane” is a descriptive figure of speech drawn from sense-perceptions of objects in space, misleading unless we pass in thought from symbol to reality symbolized, noting the fact that we are endeavoring to think in correspondences, in contrast with the language of mere “things.”

Since causality is always by this action of life (as a higher level) into the receptacles for it within a lower level, we note the same principle in the inner experiences of man, exemplified by the relation of the spiritual world to the natural. When we once see why causality is by contiguity, we realize how far from possible it would be for what is discretely different, to flow into what is beneath it in type and function, as if separateness between interiors and exteriors
could be effaced. Differences are always essential to functions. Their effacement would mean interfusion of energies without law and order, thus chaos.

The central proposition that, what is created is not continuous from the Lord because what was continuous would have been God Himself, needs frequent repetition because discreteness, in general, is the clue to definiteness of thinking, in striking contrast with numerous fallacies everywhere current among us. Since what is internal coheres with what is external, by what is distinct in each at large, the same is true down to the most infinitesimal detail. Hence, the circumstances of the one is not continuous with those of the other.

The characteristic instance is seen in the relationship between what is in eternity and what is in space and time. Were these continuous, we would see the Divine by some miracle becoming a creature of time encompassed by space, as if the Lord were imprisoned in the closed universe of His own making. The great contrasts between eternity and time hold all along the line. Causality is invariably by what is concealed from all external observation. It is always to be understood by reference to the appearing of the internal in the external, interiors in exteriors.

Continuous degrees, as in the diminution of light from fame to darkness, are determined by distance. Discrete degrees are never determined by what is remote or far, but by what is prior and posterior, so that the function is understood by what is prior, the organ by which is posterior; and by discrimination between the living endeavor, the forces imbued by it, and the resulting motions which are set up to carry it out. The endeavors by which we carry the will into execution are, therefore, not to be confused with the consequent activity of forces in the body, the motions of arms and legs, of the vocal organs, or with any other movement.

This distinction is obvious when we compare an effort of will with a gesture made by the arm. But what is plain in this instance, is everywhere a law. The purpose for which a thing exists
is the clue. Knowledge of the cause by which it operates enables us to see its function in conformity with this purpose. The effect resulting from the activity is seen in the bodily gesture, which we describe by reference to the arm, its muscles, and their modes of response. It would be impossible to change the purpose into the cause, or the cause into the bodily process. These are always distinct steps. Nor can we reverse the process and see the bodily operation becoming the cause, dictating the purpose. The purpose may originate in any act of will, which is dependent, in turn, on thought in behalf of the plan of action. But will does not become understanding.

Thought does not become the endeavor essential to beginning the function. Nor does function blend with bodily changes. Each holds its place in a series. Thought works constructively, in developing the plan. Will works dynamically, in giving the impetus or endeavor. The productive behavior seen on the bodily plane is the chief result, externally speaking. But there are also results in case of each level. For influx continues to function within, leading to yet other moments of experience, while the body is carrying out decisions of thought and behests of will.

The remarkable fact is that mind communicates with and through body, and yet never becomes body. Correspondence between soul and body is not, then, by symbolical relation only, as if a gesture were a mere representative of an idea or intention: it involves actual causality and this in terms of differences in degree between them. Soul remains distinct from body throughout existence in the natural world. Yet, it also communicates its will so that the body carries will’s commands into execution. Thus man, through correspondence of soul and body, participates in the behavior of men and animals in the natural world. On the inside, there is the marvelous organism which we describe with reference to conduct by appeal to the motives to which it is due, the intentions or purposes actuating it, the good or value manifested. On the outside, there is the responsive so-called “mechanism,” so often described in our day as if the bodily behavior
were the sole process. What we ordinarily call man’s experience, as he moves among his fellows from day to day, involves a conjunction of conduct (as moral) with behavior (as bodily or physical). Man’s conduct is explicable by what he loves and wills. The higher in the scale his love is traced, the more widely his conduct differs in type from what his body is seen doing; for example, when the body is in a certain position, as in prayer, while the spirit is remote from spatial things absorbed in thought on Divine truth. Man’s behavior is explicable by reference to what it has been trained to do, as in manipulating a machine. His conduct-behavior manifests his purpose in definite deeds. Understanding the two series, we can supply imaginatively what is going on in brain and nervous system, and in the bodily organs in general; and what is going on in the mind when a motive becomes dominant, when love for the neighbor displaces self-love and desires for mere wealth or earthly power. Granted man’s selective ability to renounce greed and selfish ambition when a higher prompting ensues, we may complete the structure of his moral deeds by appeal to freedom of will, conscience, responsibility, and other ethical principles.

Summarizing the doctrine of the relationship between spirit and body, we note that this teaching corrects all theories of mind-body relation which fail to show that the efficiency is through the spirit; for we have seen that all bodily processes are essentially reactive, never causes, but always effects of activities traced to the spiritual world as their basis. The principle of correspondence makes possible a correlation of all facts, experiences, and processes involving relations described in the foregoing. The first emphasis falls on influx as the nearby source of spiritual life and mental activity, the efficiency in all conduct through the brain into overt behavior. The principles, faculties, activities, and mental states in general—related to their bodily counterparts by correspondences—are not separated from the results which spring from them. For the influx from spirit to body produces the external effects of which the internal states are
causes, although spiritual life does not actually become bodily force. Thus, an affection of love finds expression in a representative bodily deed, with facial changes and gestures, and other overt signs indicating that the relation is intimate. So, too, in the discrete degrees which seem not only to distinguish, but to separate, there is an actual process of change from spirit-functions to nature-processes, as unlike as the one may be from the other.

A degree is not then set up to keep things apart, as if the change were wrought by miracle. The emphasis is still dynamic. Influx, as the vitalizing principle, is more important psychologically than either correspondence or degrees; while doctrinally, the principle of discrete degrees is essential in order to avoid all confusion between the Lord and man, the Lord and the world, spiritual and natural, soul and body, and cause and effect. This distinctiveness of doctrine is also of great moment in discriminating the psychology from any theory with which it might be confused. Since the spiritual mind is different in degree from the “unconscious” or subconscious of present-day theories, because its vitalizing impetus is from influx, the description of all hidden processes is different from the start, in contrast with the view that there are self-operative “mechanisms.” The discrimination between influx from the Divine, and influx from the world into the mind from below, is also of great practical significance. For, given this contrast, the utility of the doctrine of correspondences is clearly seen, by avoiding the assumption that everyone in man’s external life is in perfect correspondence with everything in the mind.390
Chapter 23
Mental Planes

Before correlating the principles outlined in the preceding chapters to show the development of knowledge, we shall briefly reconsider the relationship between soul and mind in the two-fold sense in which the latter term is used. It is especially important to keep immediately before us such terms as substance and form, in order to make headway with the elaborate doctrine of knowledge. Even though this is a psychology of love-will, it is highly rational or intellectual in form. In fact, doctrine is momentous from first to last. The doctrine of knowledge is essential throughout because all are due to universals, and all truth is from the Lord, including principles of knowledge apparently produced by analysis of sense-experience.

Reviewing the description of the spirit and recalling the specific sense of which “soul” is used, we observe that the soul is defined by reference to both substance and form, the first of these terms being used in the sense of substance-energy. The substance of the soul being spiritual, its form as human is organized to function through the natural body, which corresponds to it in fullness of detail. Its substance is not self-derived; its form not self-existent. In form and substance, it is adapted to receive, assimilate, and manifest Divine Life through influx and transmission. In order to avoid any misconception due to the peculiar term “receptacle,” as applied to the soul, we have called the essential function transmissive. When there are no obstructions, the soul readily transmits love and wisdom from the Divine influx.
The soul is the most real where most inwardly related to the Lord. In this sense, it is the basis of various activities and qualities which give it distinctive being, on the higher and lower planes of its relationships. The term “substance” refers to the principles which give to the soul its highest characteristics, not to material substances as ponderable. The term “form” applies to the definite structure by which the soul functions both in the spiritual world, and through the body, in the natural. The idea of the form of the soul is not identifiable with the imagery of the body, with its anatomical structure, the spirit, giving form to the body, is above or interior to the visible form; it is not a mere essence, not like a crystal sphere, solid and impermeable, like an atom or monad. Its interiors are organized to cooperate with Divine life, inflowing to sustain and quicken. The structure is, indeed, very highly organized, finely tempered. As designed for existence in the two worlds, the spirit is to be pictured both in detail, and at large, with special emphasis on recipiency and transmissiveness.

The term “mind,” in its first meaning, does not imply distinctness from soul or spirit, for the mind is the soul with reference to its higher functions. Thus, the angelic mind is given to man as wisdom from the Lord; this mind is the spiritual man himself—as his mind in the individual sense, such is the man in question. Again, “form” applies to man’s state with respect to love and wisdom, hence, to interior variations by which its contents are described. The contrast between soul and mind (as descriptive) comes into the foreground with recognition of the teaching that the same soul functions from infancy to old age, and from the natural world into the spiritual. But the stages of development from infancy through old age and beyond, as well as the states which give content to man’s development, are described with reference to the “plane” of activity in question. The general principle is that every mind receives according to its form; the essence of the mind has no quality except from form.391
The spiritual mind, being then a form of Divine good and truth, spiritually and naturally
organized, the natural mind is mind in lesser degree, the brain its form. The spirit of man is his
intelligence and his “love’s affection,” together with whatever goes forth and operates from
these, these affections in action being more specifically the spiritual mind. That is, the spiritual
mind (mens) is understanding and will in a general sense; made one by love, it is described with
reference to its functions, its basis and essence in these operations being will-understanding.
These faculties or functions include “in all their complexity,” all activities which affect man as
spirit, and from which he thinks.\textsuperscript{392}

As rational, the spiritual mind disposes or orders its activities and contents. Receiving the
Divine influx, it, in turn, “inflows” into the natural mind. Explicitly interior, it is internal eye and
shines forth in the eyes. It is, in brief, the mind of the internal man in every sense of the word,
distinguishing man from brute animals. More significantly still, it is not in space; hence thought
from it is higher in degree. As “organic,” it is in series, bundles, ordinated of substances. These
indicate, in part, why it is highly organized. It is also end, cause, and effect; and in three degrees,
which may be figuratively described as regions, each with its correspondence.

It is the mind, as organized in three degrees which, broadly speaking, is the receptacle of
Divine influx. But the mind of a given individual should, of course, be described with reference
to the degrees open. A mind not open in the celestial degree, is not receptive of celestial influx.
In the celestial degree, the mind is truly an image of God; in the spiritual degree, it is a lesser
image; in the lowest degree, it is still less representative. Below the level of spiritual-
mindedness, the Divine image is put off, howbeit the faculty of understanding is retained, also
the power of speech. Lower still, man’s mentality is like that of the beasts of the earth.
The spiritual mind, in general, is organized out of spiritual substances, and this term substance yields the clue, to be followed from first to last, namely, by remembering that the mind is an organic form constituting man to be truly a spirit. Mental activities will then always be put in right relation by starting with the inmost, where spirit is in its essence, then considering internals, and in a more exterior way, the mind’s externals. We thus see why the mind can turn in three directions, why it is like three stories in a house, with three loves which may be rightly subordinated and coordinated.

The Divine influx—as Life, Wisdom, Providence—flows into man in the inmost, from which the influx is into the spiritual mind as internal, with will and understanding as interior principles, the natural mind being external by contrast. We repeat this to show the minuteness of detail in which the affiliation with influx is traced. Beginning with will-understanding, therefore, as first in order in the types of mentality, we turn to man’s lower mind, thence, to the mind in relation to the body, with its structures, beholding one system from inmosts to outermosts. Will and understanding receive power solely through spirit: mind, regarded as taking shape in conduct and bodily behavior, also has power through the forces of the body. Thus, while activity of the highest type is to be understood from within, man’s actions and speech as we all know them proceed from the lower region of the mind, although indirectly from the higher mental region known as spiritual. The inmost degree directly pertains to will in relation to good, to understanding in relation to truth. The more interior mentality pertains to affections and rational principles, the less interior, to desires and matters of memory. The outermost mentality is corporeal and sensuous. The inmost, as the Lord’s dwelling-place in man, is, of course, above mind in so far as mind is identified with what we usually call consciousness. But spiritual-
mindedness, as such, is to be freely thought of in relation to the spiritual haven with its substances, also in relation to influx from the spiritual world (mediate influx).

We may then proceed with the study of will in the conscious sense of the term as responding to Divine good and love (of which man is not conscious in their essence), also the study of understanding as responding to Divine truth and wisdom. In the one case, affections arise, in the other thoughts, both admittedly spiritual in the precise meaning of the term now before us, while speech and action are natural in degree and type, although thus deriving their forms of expression in part from the higher degree.

The order of our mentality is “successive,” when followed from lowest to highest, noting how one stage comes after another until an impetus from within meets it and it is grounded in a concrete deed. The order is “simultaneous” when the life implied in the outermost deed expresses influx derived from the inmost. While then the third degree, corresponding to the third heaven, seems for the moment inferior, it is both celestial-natural and spiritual-natural; it involves power enabling heavenly realities to become grounded in concrete things, so that the Lord and man, and spirit and matter are side by side.

The natural mind (animus) as the “lower” mind, lies deeply hidden. Its correspondences are shown in the face. It is represented in all the organs and functions, and in the structure of the body. It is disposition in contrast with character, insofar as character is defined in terms of the internal man who lives after death. Its sphere manifests the quality of man’s life as carried out in his conduct and behavior. It possesses innumerable affections, with derivative inclinations, associated with the passions, thus, with the proclivities in general which we identify with the lower loves, hardly to be distinguished from bodily propensities. As cohering with the body, men possess it in common with the animals. But it also serves as means of expression in natural form
for affections and thoughts pertaining to the spiritual mind. As involving desires, cupidities, also lusts, it can best be described when we come to these terms. As implying an external rational degree, it is definable about the rational principle. In other respects, it relates to the commonly known activities of moral, civil, and domestic life; to mechanical and useful arts, and to scientific interests in the subordinate sense in which “science” is used, that is, about facts acquired through the senses, remembered facts, and knowledge based on memory. The exterior memory derives its content from the activities of the natural mind. We have already considered these, its contents and principles, so far as they pertain to the senses, to sense-perception, and to external mental activity at large. We reserve for later treatment those matters which can best be considered when the sphere of knowledge is before us.

Planes and Degrees

A plane may be defined as a recipient stage of development, or product, in which higher influences terminate. Thus, the exterior memory is a plane, lower in type than the interior memory. Divine influx terminates in conscience as a plane, inferior in type to spiritual perception. Degrees we may define as distinctions of principle and value in successive orders and relationships. Thus, interior goods are superior and prior to exterior goods, the external or natural is an outermost degree in comparison with the internal or spiritual, celestial perception is the higher degree than spiritual. There is a descent from the Divine through degrees, from plane to plane, such that all degrees are intelligible in their gradations from highest to lowest, followed by an ascent in so far as man is responsively lifted through progress in goods and truths.

The inmost degree is the dwelling-place of the Lord, who is infinite, eternal, Life itself, Love itself, and Wisdom itself; and who creates the human spirit in His image and likeness as an
organ of life. The inmost degree in man receives goods and truths immediately, although man in his consciousness (which is mediate) is unaware of the direct presence. These doctrines are thus safeguarded against falsities by emphasis on the integrity of the inmost degree. From this degree, the others follow: all three-foldness in man, in the heavens, and man’s relationship to the heavens takes its cue from the following classifications.

1. The Celestial Degree: the highest type of reception of Love and Wisdom; the celestial or highest heaven, characterized by love towards the Lord and perception of this love; the sphere of celestial angels; the celestial type of goods and truths, from the Lord as goodness itself and truth itself (the Word).

2. The Spiritual Degree: the degree of the spiritual mind, will and understanding, as recipients of Love and Wisdom in lesser measure, or less directly than the inmost; the spiritual heaven, characterized by love to the neighbor, and perception of this love or charity; the sphere of spiritual angels; psychologically significant through the type of perception which sets the standard for spiritual knowledge, rationality, and intelligence.

3. The Celestial-Natural Degree, and Spiritual-Natural Degree; involves the spiritual mind through “love of use;” the natural or “ultimate” heaven, characterized by charity towards the neighbor from affection of truth, without perception of this charity; psychologically significant through outermost expressions of interior knowledge and activity.

The natural mind, with which psychology is ordinarily concerned, involves reason as an external degree, knowledge as a scientific degree implying memory-knowledges, and sense-
processes (the sensuous degree, including relationship through the physical body with the world in space and time).

The relationship between the spiritual and the natural minds is seen by reference to the internal and the external: (1) internal: formed to the image of heaven; forms recipient of Divine life; that region and capacity in man which enables him to be in the spiritual world, while living in the natural world; the spirit or soul; the spiritual man the internal man, also the internal of man’s spirit, internal thought (will and thought in highest form); (2) rational (intermediate): The Divine life flows into the rational mind or principle, yielding capacity to think as a man, with conscience, insight into goods and truths, and in its higher phases as “spiritual light;” (3) external: formed to the image of the world, in the light of the world, “natural light”; the natural man, the external man, also the external of man’s spirit, external thought, from sensuous or corporeal things; that region or capacity in man which enables him to function in the natural world; relatively inordinate and generally further from the Divine, appertaining to the body; represents speech, action (will and thought in expression); in relation to holiness, the external holds internal things in order, form, connection, in the sense that the external is the terminus in which internals find support. The spiritual mind reaches down into the rational, as intermediate. The natural mind reaches up in a measure into the rational in the lesser or inferior sense, as the “first rational.” In general, the rational man sees things in natural light, which is the light ordinarily implied in psychology. But the present doctrine, differing from other ordinary descriptions of the mind, discloses the mind as seen in spiritual light, including even the body or “ultimate degree.”

The Divine Order
The relationship of planes and degrees is made still more explicit by reference to forces, forms, and the principle of “order.” Force may be defined as energy acting from within-outward so that internal and external correspond, intermediate forms being kept in connection and equilibrium: thus, subsistence is possible. Equilibrium is balance by opposites and reaction, also between two loves, two worlds, and is essential to man’s freedom. Form is structure or organization. Thus, truth is the form of good, faith of love. Man’s “internal” is his first form. Impressions made by objects of sense-experience produce variations of form (mentally speaking) in the exterior memory. These forms vary with changes of state of affections and persuasions. The body is the form put on by the spirit. External things are images and forms. Communicating truths constitute a certain form for recipients who respond to goods. Life is diversely received, as determined by the form of each thing. The heavens correspond to the organic forms of the human body: functions are one with these forms. Pure organic forms are more interior than grosser. Since all things exist for a purpose, the end or “use” (as prior) is a form. Members and organs are constituted accordingly. Prior, or more interior still, Divine life constitutes the forms of goods and truths. Man forms his own soul in so far as he induces a form on the purest substances. The perpetual variety of the good is due to the form of various distinct things. Will is formed from love, understanding from the form of will. Man is heaven in least form, as far as his interiors receive heavenly life; he corresponds to societies as forms. Contrariwise, forms in hell are opposites or inversions of form, perversions of order, forms of hatred or revenge, for example. Form in the human mind is progressive according to increments of goods and truths; in heaven, according to numbers of beings in whom goods and truths are intensified. Thus, form extends throughout the system, and consideration of it is essential to knowledge of Divine Order.
Order as a principle depends on the degrees, descents, and ascents already mentioned. It is exemplified in celestial things ruling spiritual and, through these, what is natural, thence corporeal things. There is an order from the spiritual through the natural to the scientific, in the sphere of knowledge. Order is dependent in man on his type, his degree of openness; for example, in doing good as from one’s self, for the sake of the neighbor, or for the Lord; in seeking truth from various motives. It is implied, too, in the successive stages of influx: from goods to truths and their derivatives, from loves to affections and delights; from inmost to outermost, primes to ultimates, the prior to the posterior. It is involved, also, in Divine law throughout the universe, the two worlds, in Divine disposition or providence, and in all heavenly ends and purposes, to which all causality as spiritual is due.

The Ultimate Plane

The outermost or bodily plane, as the last in the series of principles from spiritual to natural things, requires special consideration because it is peculiar to this doctrine. This plane is called “ultimate” because it is last in the eternal sense. Hence, ultimates are invariably outermost in the doctrine. This term is never used in its philosophical sense, as that which is final at the top of the scale, beyond which thought cannot go. To avoid ambiguity, “outermost” is preferable.

An outermost is the terminus of a descending series, as in considering types of knowledge, so-called “scientifics” being items or facts relating to outermost things in which are terminated interior things in their order. Thus, the corporeal is the lowest of all things in man. His body is an outermost in relation to the spirit, the most external plane wherein his spiritual activities are terminated. Hence, sensuous facts are lowest in the scale of knowledge. Man’s bodily deeds are external images of intentions and thoughts within his spirit. There is, in the
scale of his experiences, a descent from inmost to outermosts. There is, in the reverse direction, an ascent from what is most external to what is most internal. This two-fold process is typical of the outgoing and up-going of the Divine life in the universe.

The natural is, in general, the last term in Divine Order. This means that principles which were at first interior, but have become exterior in their expression, are “together” with their embodiment in outermosts. If the outermost degree corresponds with prior things which the outmost represents, the prior principles are together in the outermosts. For things thus externalized are receptacles of whatever is prior to them. The external, then, holds together in form, order, and connection what is essential to the series. In this sense, the outermost is a highly significant containant; since truths and goods thus externalized are said to find “support” therein. Therefore “all power is in ultimates.” Fully to understand the outermost, is to apprehend and make explicit its inmost content. This content is marvelously rich in value; since, as “spiritual sense” in the “natural,” it holds heavenly truths in potential forms, awaiting spiritual discovery and interpretation through enlightenment.

More specifically, there is an affinity between inmost and outermosts, but not conjunction. The life of man passes through the several degrees from inmost to that which is last. His life thus becomes more and more general, in outermosts most general. The degrees remain; they are not overcome or transcended. Not until we attain the level of spiritual perception, are we able to see the inmost in the outermost, and then only because such perceptions are from degrees as constant distinctions, always retained. The sense in which the internal does not exist without the external then becomes plain, also the reason why forms are essential, and the meaning of subsistence as underlying existence.
The psychological clue is already implied in the process by which thoughts and intentions terminate in conduct, the prior activity or purpose coming forth “together” in the form which the deeds assume. The cause is then seen in the effect, the superior embodied in the inferior. On the widest scale, the spiritual world is terminated in the natural. Whatever terminates represents; and what represents, has affinity with the spiritual reality portrayed. This manifestation is so intimate that the spiritual world has its feet and soles as it were in the natural.

It is because all things in the spiritual world seek something ulterior in which to be founded and that all natural things respond to the same process and seek what is most external. The ulterior is, in general, the body of what is interior. Life never becomes quiescent save so far as it thus attains what is ulterior in the scale. In other terms, interior principles inflow even to outermosts and there come to a stand where interior and exterior are together. The inmost then holds the center. The exterior things make the circumference, the interior encompass the center. Thus, the spirit of man is central to the organism through which it is clothed and made manifest.

We note also that, as all the interior principles are together in the outermost, there is an appearance of life as if life were in the body, when it is not to separate the body from the Divine government. “The Lord rules ultimates equally as his primes.” The order from inmost to outmosts is the Divine Order. Indeed, the Divine Order of manifestation is such that it is necessary for the presence of the Lord to be equally in ultimates and primes. There are continual successions from the First, the Creator of the Universe, down to outermosts, both in man and in nature.

Putting this principle in terms of spiritual knowledge as a process, we note that the Divine truth proceeding from the Lord has in it all power; hence it is that there is power also in truths in the ultimate of order. The psychological process in man is identical with the Divine Order in
whatever form we investigate it. The special point is that Divine influx, which we are apt to think of as related to the inner life in a peculiar or privileged way, tends to the extreme of man’s nature, even to the outermosts of his body. To grasp this idea in its fullness is to realize that the sensuous plane, as the extreme, is not removed from influx, but is intelligible only as a vehicle or receptacle, never by itself. Since the sensuous is the “ultimate of life with man,” it is intelligible in relation to Divine life, however far man may have wandered into sensuality by opposing heavenly influx.

As the outermost contains all the interior things which it manifests and is their general principle in which they come to rest and upon which they stand, we may start with the outermost and work toward the inmost, as surely as when we begin with interiors. The end always stands first in order, then the cause, next the effect, or “last.” Thus, to will an act comes first; to think about it and give it definiteness in preparation for action comes second; it is in the doing that will is made complete. To have insight into a human deed in its completeness is therefore to possess the adequate principle of true understanding. Both the highest and the lowest signify the whole, thus understood. The highest through the outermost holds together all interiors as intermediates in connection and form, so that they pertain to one Divine purpose. Thus, the text of Scripture regarded as a type of the outermost embodying the inmost is holy above even the internal principles taken one by one; for when the Lord is in the outermost, He is simultaneously in all things. 397 Thus, the body is the “temple of the Holy Spirit.” In the temple or receptacle, thus regarded, is all strength and power as well as all holiness. The outermost principle of the series, regarded as summarizing and unifying all that has gone before, is the same as the whole of any member of the series. 398 For the last as embodying the First is Divine Order itself made concrete, investing the spiritual with its garment, presenting it correspondently.
Approaching this principle in another way, we once more note that Divine Order never subsists in the middle, as if the creative life could form anything without an outermost; for nothing can be in its perfection in an intermediate stage. Although we often try to think of creation as beginning with the simplest external things, in reality, creation began first from the inmost, and proceeded to the outermost, therein subsisting for the first time; and it was when external things had been completed so that Divine life subsisted in them, that man was created in such wise that all things in Divine Order, from firsts to lasts, were collected in him. Man is not of Divine Order in form merely because he is spirit with an inmost, any more than he is that Order in miniature because of his body. He was constituted of the Divine Order in form, both because into his inmost were collected those principles which are in the “primes” of that Order, and because into his outermosts were collected those things which are in its last term (the ultimate).

Our study does not then start with mind and proceed to spirit, or with mind and thence to body. It starts with Divine Order as comprehending firsts and lasts, always noting the peculiar part played by last terms.

As we unthinkingly refer to the face of the bodily form of a person, as if the visible counterpart were the real self, so we are apt to judge actions apart from their interior context. Again, we abstract the inner world as ideal and neglect the natural. Indeed, we sometimes isolate the ideal as if spiritual by itself, as we project the soul theoretically into heaven without even a spiritual body to give it concrete form. It is characteristic of this doctrine of outermosts to insist that, whatever constitutes man’s spiritual world, in the guise of thought and will, inflows into his natural world of sensations and actions where his spiritual world ceases and subsists by finding embodiment. If man did not possess these modes of manifesting the ideal, if he were devoid of termini, his spiritual world would dissolve like things intermediate or devoid of a bottom. But,
the mean of expression is not to be thought of merely with respect to the physical body, or in references to the life after death, with respect to the spiritual body. The termini here classed in general as last things, include not alone the bodily instrument, but also the purpose, work or action, the exercise and general expression, as the complex and containant of all prior things. Unless will and understanding imparted themselves in works or deeds, they would be no whit better than airy nothings which pass away. But, having said that they do thus find expression, we have disclosed a vast world of human and divine values. Hence, the “last” is a brief way of suggesting all that was first.

To say all this, is not to neglect the principle previously insisted on, that all things exist in degrees. For the outermost, covered round about as it is by things that are traceable to their several sources, is to be envisaged as distinct from the prior things embodied. Thus, there are various values wrought by the Lord out of last things. So, in our deeds, there is an endeavor toward these “uses.” It is of practical significance to note that, in so far as man closes outermosts, he deprives himself of opportunities for purification. Whatever is intermediate in him, depends on the succession of activities from inmost to outermosts. It is highly important to view all life’s processes in the light of the principle that there is an inherent trend toward outermosts. This principle gives us a view of spirit and body in most intimate relation. Time is required to permit this doctrine of lasts to enter fully into our thought. It has less value in relation to the body. Its importance lies in its significance for knowledge; for it is essential to the understanding of correspondences.
Chapter 24
The Nature of Knowledge

There are several approaches to the origin, nature, use, and spiritual significance of knowledge. There are also several terms which belong in close relation, some of which are peculiar to these doctrines, notably “scientifics” and the “rational” (lower and higher), also the subordinate term “memory-knowledges.” Since knowledge of one type or another relates to all planes and degrees, it is classified in terms of the exterior and sensuous, the interior and intellectual, or interior and spiritual. It may be regarded with respect to both incoming and outgoing processes, in relation to the subject-matter which experience yields, and in connection with Divine truth, by bringing rationality and spirituality into their appropriate places in the scale. Thus, the doctrines involve, by implication, a logic and a theory of knowledge, as well as a psychology. Some of these allied meanings will come before us in this chapter and the two following chapters. Our study necessarily becomes somewhat elaborate at this point, in order to indicate the logical thoroughness of the system.

Knowledge, as such, is not so fundamental as the understanding, which gives form to it as its organ; hence, it is not self-generating or spontaneous, as if it arose in the presence of natural objects or by virtue of a merely cerebral activity. What the mind brings to experience in contact with the world through the body is of greater moment than the items or data which sense-experiences contribute. Our study of sense-perception was based on this significant teaching.
In general, knowledge is made possible by relation, contrast, and variety.\textsuperscript{400} The quality of an object or deed declared to be “good” has this relation with respect to things more or less good and in contrast with evil. The contrast-relation is essential to all perception, to all feelings of pleasure or pain. What is enjoyable, for instances, yields pleasure in connection with its opposite. The beautiful object is such by comparison. Variety runs through the scale of things and their values. The relations by which we know things are according to degrees. Hence sensation and reception increase by degrees according to the intensity of the stimuli.

The simple in heart of course believe what they see and what they are told. But the sensuous man is one who, believing only in what he sees, hears, or is otherwise acquainted with on the evidence of his senses, denies the existence of the spiritual because he cannot see it. The lowest plane in man is turned toward what is earthly. So, the external phase of knowledge is acquired through sensuous details derived by bodily contacts and other sense-relations. The sensuous is the outermost principle of the natural plane. Since sensuous contacts with the world correspond to man’s bodily existence, there is an internal sensuous which bears relation to understanding and will.\textsuperscript{401} The sense-items, thus derived, are stored in the memory, where they become the basis for the type of knowledge already mentioned as memory-knowledge (\textit{scientific}), in contrast with knowledge possessed through the internal relation (\textit{cognitions}). When man is absorbed in corporeal things, such as appetites, pleasures, and sense-desires, these rule him. This sense-absorption yields a corresponding type of knowledge. The corporeal is in opposition to the good, the sensuous to the true; for neither goods nor truths are known on this plane.

To put the facts and principles in right relation is to see that some matters depend on sensuous things, some pertain to intellect, others to will. Thus, matters of sight relate especially
to intellect, matters of hearing less so, while pertaining secondarily to will. The subject-matter of smell and taste belongs both to intellect and will. Touch relates specially to will. The intellect believes, acknowledges, and knows; it sees truth and apprehends goodness. The function of the will is to be affected by love towards goods and truths.

The term “sensuous” is not limited to evil desires and bodily passions. It refers to all things presented to the bodily senses, and to the internal states pertaining to these. On the sensuous plane, a man is not necessarily “sensual.” Without the sensuous plane, man would be unable to communicate with the world; he would not exist here. Yet sensuous things ought, of course, to be assigned to their proper place in the scale, with wisdom ruling and bodily activities subordinate. Sensuous things yield what is of service to the mind’s interiors: the wise man thinks above them, leaving the way open for the understanding of truth. Thus, sensuous experiences serve an end unlike that of sensuality.

Man’s essential processes may, indeed, function in the inverted order, when sensuous things are put first, in both will and deed. The order of knowledge may also be inverted, whereas sensuous knowledge rightfully belongs in the lowest place. Since man is governed by the principles he assumes, his reasoning will favor his assumptions, true or false. Hence, if dominated by mere “things,” his intellect favors the sensuous. When the will is confirmed in evil desires, man’s whole life tends to become sensual. Again, if man assumes that nothing is to be believed until seen with the bodily eyes, touched, or otherwise examined by aid of the senses, he will exclude spiritual and celestial realities; since these matters are neither detected by the external senses, nor conceived by imagination, so long as the mind depends on sensuous imagery alone. The true order of knowledge is to be wise from Divine truth, so that all principles relating
to spiritual and celestial things shall follow in order. Then, these higher principles can be confirmed by natural facts, memory-knowledge being attributed to its proper place.

In general, knowledge of anything higher involves perception of what is lower, as knowledge of good implies knowledge of evil, all opposites being relative. But an opposing interest, such as absorption in bodily appetites and pleasures, may take away perception. Hence the reason for discriminating good from evil, truth from error, and reality from appearances. Otherwise the mind might mingle opposites and become utterly confused.

The true function of sense-knowledge is to exalt the mind. For man’s mind can be raised from natural knowledge to spiritual intelligence, thence to celestial wisdom. It is love for successively higher objects which brings about the ascent. Knowledge alone is insufficient. Love yields the dynamic. Man has freedom and rationality. He has ability to reflect within himself and make intellectual progress. But he needs something more than mere knowledge or an intellectual plan, as an incentive to overcome difficulties, and to banish falsities and evils.

Since all external sensations derive their efficiency, not from the mere deliverences of the senses, but from internal sensations pertaining to understanding and will, sense-objects are made perceptible through the sense-organs by means of an internal activity. This is the order of all sense-knowledge because influx is from internal to external. There is, we have seen, no incoming productive activity from the natural world to the spiritual, as if natural events as such were causes of perception. This is a cardinal point. The conception of knowledge depends on attributing the efficiency to influx. Coming from within, influx manifests through appropriate organs, it meets and fosters the assimilation of the ideas of sense-perception on which we build our knowledge of the external world.
To start otherwise, would be to think from effects only, thus from fallacies; hence, the significance of knowledge of degrees. One might, indeed, have a measure of knowledge within a continuous degree, from sensuous experience merely. We have acquaintance with things on their own plane which does not concern us on higher planes. But the situation is very different when we endeavor to trace the whole process of knowledge in the ascending scale, from lowest to highest (or first) knowledge. To think from effects, is to possess knowledge in the conventional sense only: to think from causes, is to possess intelligence. Only when we think from ends do we possess wisdom or insight. Thus, knowledge is classes as it rises from outermosts to the intermediate plane, thence to inmosts. These planes are so distinct that man has three minds, one for each level of experience: these three attain their unity on the highest plane.

The natural mind, a little world, receives its items of experience from the world to which it corresponds. Everything which the natural mind receives as subject-matter is from the natural world. As the body, when in a sound condition, is a foundation on which to build, so that the rational life is the superstructure—the spiritual being so comparable to the person who dwells in the house—so the natural plane, in general, is understood by the way it is utilized. It has no more power to produce what is above than a foundation to produce a house and create an occupant.

Since even the lowest type of perception is by influx, no explanation of knowledge is possible, save by reference to its highest source. This holds true even though the description of the physiological basis of knowledge reads like materialism. We read that “the natural mind, with all its belongings, is coiled into gyres from right to left.” Also, that in its own form, it is “woven out of the substances of both worlds in the brains, where it has its first principles or seat.” It is even said that “the life of man in its first principles is in the brains.” Since we contract the forehead and otherwise exert the organism when we think, we have assured evidence
that we think in the brain. Thought seems, indeed, to come forth from the brain. In fact, a materialistic conception of knowledge apparently follows from the fact that will and understanding, essential to sense-perception, are localized in the cerebellum and cerebrum, as if there were nothing more to say about these facilities. Yet, these statements do not take us beyond the physiological factors of knowledge. Such factors are merely instrumental. Our sense-experience yields items. But it is the general idea, ruling all, which gives knowledge. General ideas come through the understanding; not from outside, not from the brain. As real and appealing as a sensuous fact may be, for instance, when the hand strikes a wall, the merely particulars of such an impact do not show what reality is. True rationality never proceeds from what is external. The perspicuity of reason comes from the Divine, through the internal into the external.

All sense-knowledge, then, is limited. We do not know by appeal to sensation of what elements the brain is constituted. We do not know, in detail, what the heart and lungs are, what the liver is, the spleen, the pancreas, or the nature of the eye, the ear, the tongue, the stomach, or the generative organs. All that sensation discloses is items of experience amidst a general sense-feeling so vague that we cannot tell by self-observation where body leaves off and mind begins. Hence, mind and body appear to be one. Memory registers impressions produced through the senses. Memory-images, recurring, supply subject-matter for memory-knowledge, the kind a child may have of the world in which he lives. “Scientifics” are these items or data of presented sense-experience: items concerning objects seen, touched, and otherwise encountered. These facts, stored in the exterior memory, constitute what we may also call tentative or experiential knowledge. Such knowledge includes acquaintance with appearances, such as the notion that the sun rises and sets, subject to correction in the light of surer knowledge of nature.
Knowledge in a higher sense involves insight into contrasts such that we distinguish reality and appearance, truth and error. Truth takes on its quality through awareness of falsity as its opposite, as light is known by comparison with darkness, heat through experience of cold, and color by various contrasts.\textsuperscript{410} Hence, we correct “scientificals” and press on to principles which prove valid amidst all tests. Higher knowledge discloses the items of memory-knowledge in their proper relation. Hence we depend less on things as they appear, more on understanding of things in their system.

Even when we arrange facts so that we formulate a “law,” it is still a question of higher and lower types of knowledge. We speak of the “nature of things,” meaning this world in space and time, with its orderly sequences involving precisely ascertainable conditions. To ascend one plane higher, is to consider the spiritual order of things. Here, it becomes a question of the forces which produce changes in the natural world. Hence, all knowledge previously formulated as “naturalism” is subject to correction. Memory is still drawn upon, but with more persistent effort to overcome all impressions of things as they merely appear. In a sense, therefore, all natural things are appearances only. Such things “represent” spiritual realities. On the spiritual plane, we endeavor to think wholly in terms of principles based on Divine truth. We are less concerned with things, more with persons. We pass from the transitory to the eternal. Our interests center about what endures in the spiritual world.

We may illustrate by space and time, essential to knowledge of nature, to life in nature.\textsuperscript{411} Whatever is great and small—length, breadth, height, measure, figure, form—depends on spatial relations.\textsuperscript{412} Hence, all knowledge of space is in terms of these magnitudes of their endless detail. But both space and time become “null” in the other life. There it is a question of “states” of goodness (with reference to Being), and \textit{states} of truth (with reference to manifestation). Hence,
all knowledge of such states is in terms of love, life, wisdom, affections and joys. So-called
distances in the spiritual world are diversities of states, the interior life being due to variations of
state. Since spaces are circumstanced according to the states of interiors, all appearances of
states are describable accordingly. Space is not fixed or static, as on earth. Therefore, all space-
perception in the spiritual world depends on conditions prevailing there. Knowledge of such
perception includes the nature of the spiritual functions by which changes of state are discerned.
There is, of course, no infinity of either space or time in either world; since the infinite is the
same as the Divine, and the Divine is not in space, but space and time are intelligible only in
terms of Divine manifestations.

The true order of knowledge is invariably from whole to parts. To understand the spatial
appearances of either world, one must first know what space is in the Divine Order, which is
above space of either type. Again, “such as man’s life in general, such is it in singualrs . . . in the
veriest singualrs of his will, and in the veriest singualrs of his thought.” In the case of the
affections, also, the singualrs derive their quality from the general affections or love. Yet, no
universal is possible without singualrs. To see what knowledge is, in its entirety, is to see how
the universal is grounded in the particulars, for example, Divine Providence (as universal), which
is in “the veriest singualrs of nature.”

So much depends on the supremacy of universals in this doctrine of knowledge that we
may pause for a moment to pass in review the main points in various theories of knowledge, in
order to make the doctrine as explicit as possible.

The doctrine turns upon a “representative” principle to some extent, as our study of
correspondences has shown, also the analysis of representatives and imagination. But this
principle always turns upon spiritual insight into Divine truths externally symbolized by things
which portray matters of higher import than any natural things as such. Representative knowledge, as a process, would not help us far on the road to the highest truth. Higher knowledge cannot be attained by analyzing the presentations of experience. What is required is insight into eternal principles which are, indeed, “portrayed” in the world of space and time, but which are discernible in the light of this, their meaning only so far as their correspondences are seen.

Knowledge is not said to be a “copy” of objects in the world around, although memory-images do indeed reproduce for us such things as are perceived through the external senses. Not even our memory-knowledge is a mere copy, because all sense-knowledge is a union of the deliverances of the senses and the forms and activities which the mind itself contributes. Emphasis falls, not on the memory-image, but on the understanding as the faculty through which these images are cognized. Thus, the perception of distance by which we assign some objects to the immediate foreground, others to the remote horizon, is chiefly the work of the understanding. Even sensuous knowledge is an active process from within the mind, looking upward to its assimilation into rational truth. It would not be a sound conclusion, because knowledge begins on the natural plane, therefore naturalism, as a philosophy, is true.

There is no “problem of knowledge” in this doctrine. There is no doubt how we know things, no question whether we know them or not. The whole doctrine explains that we know them on their plane, according to the types of knowledge which successively lead from mere acquaintance with natural things, to celestial insight into Divine truth. There is progress through sense-perception, thought based on the exterior memory, the first “rational” and, the second, truth disclosed by spiritual perception, by celestial perception, and through divine revelation, which differs still more in degree from all naturalistic knowledge.
Nothing is said about “consciousness” as analyzing the presentations of sense-experience by distinguishing the observer as “subject,” from his experience as “object.” For consciousness is not given so important a place, nor is knowledge essentially analytical. It follows that this doctrine is not like “subjective idealism,” with its difficulties in the attempt of the thinking subject to emerge from the stronghold of self-consciousness. We have found that matter is “real,” that it consists of substances which exist outside of our organisms, whatever we happen to be doing, whether we are present among the things we have undertaken to describe, or not. So, this doctrine avoids the fancies of idealists (“visionaries”)\(^4\) who are misled by “fallacies and sophisms,” as if what appears were a mere phenomenon.\(^5\)

Nor is knowledge to be accepted because it “works” or applies (pragmatism). There are many appeals to experience or conduct in the sense that one should live by doctrine to know its truth. But truth is neither limited nor created by what “works” in finite experience. Divine truth is true, whether verified by man or not. Its principles are given him as guides to practice. And a great deal is told or taught him which he has not direct means of testing in this natural world.

Knowledge is not “experience,” as this term is ordinarily used. It is produced in the mind by means of a system of receptacles, hence it is an “implantation.” For example, Divine truths are implanted in the mind of the child that these truths may persist as “remains.” Knowledge is not a self-active process, as if facts as deliverances of experience could rise, explain and interpret themselves. Memory-knowledge does not automatically rise through correction of its fallacies so that it becomes rationalistic. Unless man had higher principles to test experience, he would not even see the value of what he learns by experience. Nor would even experience of the spiritual world be a guide, unless man possessed spiritual perception, with revealed principles essential to
its interpretation. Psychical or spiritualistic experiences, for example, are in themselves no
guides. It follows that spiritualism is untrustworthy as a theory of the great “beyond.”\textsuperscript{\textdaggerdbl}

Finally, knowledge is not “reminiscence” from some previous existence of the soul. For the soul is not exalted to that stage of importance. Nor does belief in reincarnation form any part of this doctrine. Man possesses two memories, and the knowledge made possible by the interior memory is greater than that of the exterior. But the significance of this distinction becomes clear when we realize that the exterior pertains to the body in this life, the interior to the spirit in the future, which is not to be a series of rebirths, but a higher mode of existence in the spiritual world, where the spirit will be clothed with a spiritual body.

Since God as the First is the supreme universal, which, by descending through degrees, makes all knowledge possible, the same principles follow as in considering Love or Wisdom, to which all forms are due. Thus, truth as founded in Love-Wisdom, descends by this orderly system so that its communication to the will-understanding of man is made possible. The system of knowledge and truth is the same, therefore, as the system of Divine goodness leading to specific goods, or the plan of creation leading from what is most interior to what is most exterior. The Lord creates His world, down to the minutest in the sphere of visual and tactual sensations, where we gaze at the rock-ribbed hills, or strike against a wall to prove its resistance. All goodness is from one source and is created from that single source. All truth is one in origin. The order, life, law, and process is from the same source. Reality is centrally and primarily spiritual. In man, spirit is central, and the relationships of the Lord to His universe are reproduced in man’s relation to the world. Truth is prior to knowledge, which, in turn (as a lower universal),

\textsuperscript{\textdaggerdbl} The easy inference between spiritism and Swedenborgianism was confirmed repeatedly by their supporters. Had not Swedenborg communicated with departed souls and spoken with numerous angels in his spiritual travels? Spiritism represented a powerful solvent to those groups operating on the fringe of Protestantism and looking for a connection between Swedenborg’s experiences and the trance-speaking mediumship popular in the day.
generates its particulars. It is the process of descent from highest to lowest, which explains all knowledge in its objective forms, even though what is just now happening around us seems somehow to make itself immediately known, as if our spiritual nature were not essential to such cognition. If knowledge were the process it seems to be, by emphasizing the brain, materialism would be true. So any theory of knowledge which has been current in the past, would depend on exaggerated emphasis here or there, in contrast with the truth that any doctrine, to be adequate, must befit human existence in both worlds. The human intellect loses the theoretical supremacy which it once enjoyed, with the change from Love-Wisdom in the doctrine of God, and the consequent importance of love-will in man, as essential to all understanding. Knowledge, as such, falls into its proper place, since no mental differences in man the individual make any real difference in the structure of reality. It is not, then, the doctrine of knowledge that is decisive, but Being-as-Love.

Again, the doctrine of spiritual perception is such that there are no individual distinctions in favor of a mystical intuitive knowledge declared to be “super-essential” or “supra-essential,” beyond all determinations. Divine reason is at the apex. No truth is so high as the Word, and the Word is wholly rational. What is needed is revelation of its spiritual meaning. The literal text is then seen to be the demonstration of its truths, and there is no reason for appealing to an alleged mystical type of knowledge beyond all contrasts.

Finally, as Divine truth differs in degree from naturalistic knowledge, or any theory which man propounds as merely his own, a radical distinction is to be drawn between truth and falsities of whatever type, between reality and all fallacies. There are, indeed, grades of truth and reality. But it does not follow that a false doctrine of the Godhead is partially true. A conception
of the Lord is either true or false. A falsity carries a long series of errors or misconceptions down to absurdity itself. It does not pass over into truth.

All sciences and philosophies based on the study of nature alone, are classed in a lower category, and share the fate of theologies which error in their viewpoint. The appeal to mere matters of “fact,” is not then decisive. By contrast, there are higher “facts” which “can never be apprehended by our senses, memory-knowledge, and philosophy.” Memory-knowledges ordinarily called philosophy, such as “that of Aristotle and others like him,” are once and for all subordinate. Such teachings are likely to “draw away the mind from the spiritual life.” Because such philosophy is inferior in type, it can easily lead to the confirmation of falsities, and is, indeed, likely to be used for the most part in that way.

It follows that wisdom is higher in type than knowledge. Man seems, indeed, to have acquired his wisdom and intelligence from memory-knowledges. But this is not true. Wisdom and intelligence are from the Lord alone: there is never any wisdom except from love. The true order is to be wise from the Lord. Then, all matters pertaining to knowledge can be discerned in their real light. Intelligence, for instance, is not wisdom but, at best, leads to or is a means to it. To understand what is true and good is not to be good and true, but to be wise, is to be so. Spiritual light is wisdom itself, proceeding from the Lord. When love influences the affections so that perceptions and thoughts of a like kind ensue, wisdom becomes manifest through the internal sight of the mind. Wisdom does not come because man knows many things, perceiving them in a measure of light: it comes because of conjunction with love. No man is wise from himself. Philosophy might be knowledge from one’s self only. Hence, it would be appearance, not knowledge of reality.
The difference between this doctrine and philosophy is of great moment, since our attitude will be different toward the whole system if we understand the contrast. The interest in knowledge is with respect to structure and composition, rather than from the viewpoint of development (as in recent systems). This structure finds its causal explanation in a Divine psychology. It is composed of interior and exterior elements, the former being decisive. The question how we derive the content of our knowledge from nature is a minor affair. The truth that knowledge, in the higher sense, is produced in us is the first consideration. Hence, we cannot complete this exposition until, in later chapters, we consider the process known as dictation, the mode of descent of the Word, and revelation in so far as it is a psychological activity.
Chapter 25

Reason

Reason is much higher than persuasion, for by mere persuasion, we endeavor to convince people by appeal to our personal interests. In response to self-love we readily confirm ourselves in what we want to believe. The term “ratiocination” covers all such inferior processes, especially all thought from what is false. Only by appeal to truth, as explained by this doctrine, is the mind able to overcome all these fallacies. By contrast, reason is essentially related to truth, thus to universals which include and explain all the particulars. Granted the highest universal, the Essence from which all things exist, we possess the true principle of knowledge through the whole scale of descent. Reason assures us that the Lord is one, that there could not be two Creators, two Infinites: this is God’s truth in man.

Everything depends, therefore, on the basis of our thought. When thinking of nature only, we think with reference to space and time, as germane to nature. To remain on this level of thought, limited by natural light (lumen) while trying to think about spiritual realities, would be like “thinking from the thick darkness of night about things that appear only in the light of day.” But, to disengage the mind from time and space, is to pass from darkness into light, dispelling fallacies right and left. Reason, as true light, thus involves a contrast with all lesser knowledges, and ability to start with the thought of God as omnipresent, above all limitations due to sense-perception and memory. As universal, reason is by no means limited to man the individual, but is the same in all men. The psychology of reasoning as you and I know it by
experience accordingly, starts with Wisdom as above all particular states or processes: without Wisdom no true reasoning would be possible.

The capacity to understand truths, even to their inmost degree, is presupposed in the individual, whose rationality therefore depends upon the degree of elevation of the understanding into the sphere of Divine light. When adequately enlightened, man can discriminate between reality and appearance, to detect the affections which ordinarily lag behind, keeping the mind from ascending to a higher degree. The capacity to understand is also closely related to the degree of freedom attained. The hindrances along the way do not, of course, injure spiritual principles, but fallacies may blind man to their reality and falsities may mislead him into the attendant evils.

The Lord created the rational principle in man according to the whole reality of the spiritual world. Consequently, man possesses the Divine Order, with its relationships to causality, as the central principle of all his thinking. But much depends on the conditions through which his rational function proceeds. There is an order of instruction from memory-knowledge upward, but man may invert this order and try to advance to celestial truth, by neglecting intellectual truths as means to this high end. Reason includes both the appropriate ascent, and the intellectual activities essential to this orderly advance. Memory-knowledge is plainly so inferior that it scarcely warrants the name of truth. Even scientific truth, as accepted in the world at large, is still mere knowledge, although confirmed by what is ordinarily regarded as “reason.” For it has not yet been corrected by truth founded on Divine reason, higher in degree and essential to all adequate classification. Moreover, spiritual truth, thus grounded, is also vivified by an affection which distinguishes it from all lesser so-called truth. Grounded in Love, as well
as in Wisdom, it is disclosed through will-understanding (love-intellect) in ourselves, namely, by our highest faculties working in unison.

Mere speculation is plainly inferior beyond all question. Many propositions may seem true on their own plane, although fundamentally false. To be regenerated, man must be able to discriminate such matters, and attain a high degree of maturity of judgment, passing into insight. Thus, reason is an ideal term, pointing forward to the discernment of spiritual truth, to what is most intimately celestial or Divine. Its scope is briefly indicated in the doctrines by the word “rational,” which, as a principle, refers both to the stages of descent and ascent, and to the degree of mentality attained in what is intermediate, thus twofold, internal and external. Hence, at certain points in the description what is superior, is for the time being left out of account, as if reason involved no ideal possibilities.

The rational principle is, for instance, at first merely “imitative,” as a semblance of truth, hampered by externality. It may even be closed by the mentality which is virtually “dead.” For the time being, man looks down to earthly things or outward to worldly ones, magnifying the mere receptacles of life as if they were life itself, indulging his senses and bodily inclinations. Because he lacks enlightenment, he does all this “with the concurrence of the rational.” So far, man is like a wild animal in his mode of existence, stirred by a similar nature. Man is still on this mental level before he has felt the stirrings of spiritual combat within him, when he is not yet under temptation. Unwittingly, man may be using rational power, even drawing in a measure upon the spiritual substances by which man in general receives Divine influx. Yet, this is, strictly speaking, a perversion of rationality; hence, the importance of the keenest discrimination between all perversions and right uses.
There is a three-fold classification which will guide us here. The intellectual life consists of knowledge (scientifica), an intermediate stage known explicitly as the rational (rationalia), and the highest, which is known explicitly as intellectual (intellectualia). The first type of knowledge, as we have frequently noted, starts with sense-perceptions, the external sensuous, passes into the storehouse of memory, and attains rationality only to the extent that there is an “interior,” even in what is relatively speaking external. Knowledge here serves, at best, as conjunction between external and internal, by determining this union.\textsuperscript{428} The imagery which is due to the senses of sight and hearing is an illustration of this type of knowledge. It is limited by the fact that, through knowledge of what is exterior, there is no insight into what is interior: the lower cannot discern the higher.

Yet the rational as “lower” is of three kinds: sensuous, rational, and intellectual; and thought in a measure begins on the outermost plane, despite the fact, that what is stored in the memory, is purely exterior.\textsuperscript{429} For the memory-knowledges acquired in childhood through contact with the world give a certain ability to put thought to use, and to utilize this degree of intellectuality in connection with higher processes. The first memory-knowledge is merely corporeal. But the same mentality is cooperative in the progress to rational truths, thence, to intellectual truths properly so-called, and finally to celestial.

All instruction is due to the opening of vessels or receptacles as previously described. Progressive contacts with external things, of course, play their part. But it is the influx of life from within which causes the receptacles to open. External knowledge remains distinct from the higher types because, for one thing, will and understanding, as the more direct sources of the intellectual life, receive their life from within. Memory-knowledge mounts to a certain point only. Significant ability to reflect or reason is different in type. The rational plane as intermediate
or communicating, however important it seems to be, is never the actual source of that intelligence which enables man to see the wisdom of things. The spiritual sphere is coextensive with the intellectual, the rational, and the exterior memory only in case these are imbued with life from within. The child whose memory is storing up contacts with the world of nature, may also be recipient of celestial matters. At best, memory-knowledges are outermost receptacles in which interior knowledge is terminated. The celestial and spiritual principles, by continually presenting themselves, prepare and form receptacles which are being opened. Thus, result the stages of development already mentioned, from innocence through understanding to wisdom. Ignorance as a factor in these sequences is not ignorance of what is external, but the holiness of innocence; and, in a comparative sense, recognition of the truth that man knows nothing in comparison with Divine intelligence. The “rational” as intermediate, at best, merely serves to form the interior or “middle man.” It is thus a means of communication only, between the sensuous and the intellectual.

In the advance from youth to early manhood, much depends on acquiring truths and goods pertaining to the civil and moral life, especially those which relate to spiritual life through the hearing and reading of the Word. The “rational,” then, opens responsively. If, however, man weakens mentally at a later stage, the rational is closed, also the “interior natural.” But if a man suffers himself to be regenerated, the rational so opens that the interior natural is subordinated. This is notably the case in early manhood, but it continues progressively to eternity.430 “Those under twenty years . . . do not as yet discern and conclude from themselves; consequently they cannot as yet shake off anything that is false and evil by means of the rational.”431 From the twentieth year, man indeed begins to become rational.432 The rational, as the principle which conjoins the internal with the external, is the determining factor in the conjunction. Yet the
rational is naught. What makes it significant is the love which flows into it and makes it active. Thus, the rational in general is such as the affection. Hence, when the love of the good inflows, it becomes on the rational plane “the affection of truth.” The contrary is the case when the affection of evil inflows.  

The “lower rational” is obviously a limitation. For man in this stage of mentality is unable to discern internal processes. Hence, his thought falls short. It may even suffocate, reject, or pervert the influx by which it could become effective. It lacks self-awareness. What is needed is that internal perception by which spheres are discerned in relation to the development of knowledge. A man may be misled by what he takes to be his “own.” What is lower may emulate or masquerade in the form of the higher. Hereditary evil may also intervene. Involved in appearances of many sorts, the rational may even act as one with the corporeal sensuous. Man will then readily take any information due to sensuous matters to be rational knowledge. He might, of course, distinguish between (1) being subject to what is sensuous, and (2) deriving items of knowledge from the sensuous without being subject to these items. It is not easy to tell whether a man is rational rather than sensuous. But man in himself can learn to detect the difference by study of his interior processes. There are signs of genuine progress when man begins to recognize that it is evil and falsity within him which oppose the good and the true. To discern this is really to become rational.

Sometimes the claim to rationality turns upon mere decorum, on conduct from a pretense that a person is honorable. Indeed, men devoid yet of the rational, habitually speak from sensuous and scientific considerations even more cleverly than those who possess rationality. Radically different is the state of those who, undergoing regeneration, humble and afflict what is rational, that it may submit itself. Evils and falsities are likely to rise from the external to the
rational plane, and these must be noted and subjugated. Again, in lesser states long prior to regeneration, man may be morose and contentious while under rational limitations. Self-love not only falsifies, but adulterates truths by abuse of rationality, even the rationality which every man has from the Lord. So long as the rational is in the appearance of goods and truths, with fallacies under it from sensuous things, the mind is in the shade as regards higher principles. If Divine truths were set forth in clear light, they would not be received. The appearance, even the “shade” as well as the darkness, must be dispelled, before Divine truth can be seen. The notion, in brief, that man can be rational from what is sensuous and scientific, is a sheer fallacy. It is not forbidden to cultivate the rational by means of knowledges so far as one can. What is to be guarded against is any falsity which, conjoining itself with evil, closes the rational and makes a man irrational despite all pretenses or appearances to the contrary.

In the one direction, the rational is easily identifiable with mere natural-mindedness, thus, with the light of the world, always inferior and often akin to darkness; but in the other, the rational is the mind of the internal man, and what pertains to it is in “the light of heaven.”

Man’s conduct, disclosing his motives, is a clue to the contrast between the natural and the rational. If a man is not yet genuinely rational, he is known by his pretensions, by the deceit and profanation which close the door to communication with what is rational. In case of actual progress from the natural to the rational, it is the love of the good which first consents. In general, the natural sees from the effect, the rational from causes. The rational is purer: this is the familiar contrast between the interior and the exterior. Furthermore, the rational is two planes above the affections of the body, hence, above the corporeal in general. A man may be chiefly corporeal, mostly natural, or essentially rational. The province of the natural is to minister to the
rational. Yet although the rational is purer, it has no complete life unless the natural corresponds, the former being prior, the natural posterior and subordinate when seen in proper relation.

In the right order, a principle should be true and then confirmed. The inverted order—the procedure in case of all falsities by which the natural is thrown out of true relation—is confirmation by what is false before there is insight into the true. Reason is seen in full activity only when Divine truths are confirmed by what is rational or intellectual. Decidedly inferior is any process by which a man ingeniously infers that propositions are true because he has joined them. In such a case, depraved fantasy masquerades as truth. Rationality is to be distinguished from all thought and argument which, on investigation, proves to be founded on falsities or fallacies, in contrast with thought and argument from knowledge and truth. The test is the ability to perceive inwardly that good is good, hence, that truth is truth. While the products of the natural mind are mere “scientifcs,” those of the rational imply intellectual reasons. The first, or lower rational, is at best, due to the influx of the internal into the affection for knowledge of what is external. But the second, or Divine rational, is due to conjunction of truth with good within the internal, so that the truth is distinctively a higher degree.

In its higher function, in general, the rational enables man to reflect, reason, understand the good and the true. It discloses truth not alone by contrast with memory-knowledges, but by explicit contrast with all ratiocination as false. Rational knowledge in this, its clarity, is a means to what is spiritual and celestial. Spiritual life flows into it and adapts it to itself. Indeed, it may not be only spiritual in origin, but celestial Interior thought inflowing from the Lord through the internal man is in this higher or internal rational. This is notably true with those who have conscience. Those who are devoid of conscience can have no interior thought.
In this higher sense, the rational has an apperception from the Lord concerning what is in process in the external, which reduces the external to obedience and elevates it, causing man to be genuinely man. Here, indeed, is the true function of the rational. The genuine rational consists of good and truth, the truth being the chief consideration in the rational; with the implied goods, and the love of what is good. It is now more plainly seen that the internal, the rational, and the natural shall become one, so that all important principles may be intelligibly related.

The function of the rational is in fact to dispose and ordinate. Man is unaware of this function so long as the natural dominates the rational. If man understood the entire process of his mind, he would know that the good inflows through the rational into the natural, where it illustrates knowledges found there. But essential to complete insight is acknowledgment of truths elevated above the plane of memory-knowledges, discerned with reference to their agreement with the good already in the rational. The illustration of truth on the natural plane is an aid to this process. Truth, once initiated into the good, vanishes from the exterior memory, and passes into the interior. The spiritual does not exist except in the rational, as the term is here used. Here, the spiritual man and the rational are almost identical. The sole difference is in the quality of the reason and the derivative life.

Yet, although the good within the rational yields spiritual insight, the rational as such can never apprehend what is Divine. It remains finite, and the finite cannot apprehend the infinite. There is still a respect, therefore, in which the truth disclosed is an appearance. It is a general principle, nevertheless, that these appearances of truth contain or imply the Divine; hence, that they appertain to a higher degree than any natural truth. These appearances are such as to fructify and multiply as finite expressions of the truth and the good. There is a rational so pure and high
in type that the celestial man is from this principle, in contrast with the spiritual as from the
natural.452

Here the distinctions begin to reach their finest point. For it is said that “the intermediate
between the internal of the natural and the external of the rational is . . . the spiritual of the
celestial.” The qualifications become still more minute with the statement that “the celestial
natural is good in the natural which corresponds to the good in the rational; that is, to the
celestial of the spiritual from the rational.”453 The critic might deem this an instance of such
over-refinement that cardinal distinctions lose all their meanings, as if degree blended with
degree, and as if rationalistic systems of philosophy were therefore partly true, instead of being
relegated to the plane of memory-knowledge. But to pass this judgment would be to miss the
significance of the principle of degrees as germane to this doctrine from first to last. The
movement is never from below by rationalistic inferences but is invariably due to the generative
power of universals extending their truths down into particulars.

What seems like over-refinement, proves to be clear-cut discrimination of matters
essential to the doctrine, in contrast with any possible misconception. A truly rational man, for
example, in the finest sense of the word, is “no other than he who is called a celestial man . . .
who has a perception of good, and, from good, a perception of truth; whereas he who has not this
perception, but only the knowledge that a thing is true because he has been so instructed, and
thence has conscience, is not truly a rational man, but an interior rational man.”454 Here we have
a glimpse of the rational which is man’s heaven, in contrast with any sort of natural principle as
relatively his “earth.” At no point, then, does the rational cease and give way to mystery, as
would be the case if the doctrine of knowledge included such conceptions as “super-rational” or
“supra-essential.” Not even heaven in the celestial meaning of the term is above reason or
beyond essence. Such a theory would entail a falsity. The proposition that the rational persists, even to the highest pinnacle of the celestial heaven, is highly significant for this whole system.

Amidst all this complexity we note the fact that, for practical purposes, there is a single contrast. “Two ways lead to the rational mind of man: an internal one through which enter good and truth from the Lord; and the external one through which enter evil and falsity from hell.” This may seem for the moment an over-simplification, as if in denial of the principles which we have been considering. But it is now a question of motives. If our motive admits light from heaven, the rational (between the worlds) is, indeed, illumined by Divine truth. But self-love, as a motive, turns the mind toward the irrational. The sharpest possible antithesis is needed at this point. To be rational, is to discern principles in a series, from primes to mediates, and outermosts or conclusions. One may then analytically discuss, separate, conjoin, and at last trace matters to their ulterior end. But this insight, at once synthetic and analytic, is given to man in relation to his system of practical activities or the ends which he loves. Only through the light of heaven is this knowledge possible. Wide as the poles asunder is any intellectual activity which pursues the opposite course, even though the rational is apparently enlisted. Any apparent rational, as supposedly spiritual, is to be put in antithesis with the true rational, as having one distinctive source (the inflowing Divine, which brings the light of heaven). It would be contrary to Divine order, were any man, merely through the functions of the rational mind as his “own,” to enter the spiritual in the higher meaning of the word.

The genuine rational consists, then, of truths which stand in marked antithesis to the falsities. There are degrees of truth, the civil, the moral, and the spiritual. The degrees of man’s life correspond to these. In so far as the rational principle reaches down to the worldly plane, it is opened in its first degree by civil truths. The second degree pertains to moral truths.
The third is opened by spiritual truths. The mere opening of the degrees of the rational by truths is not, however, the complete process. Life according to truths brings this fullness. Hence, love is once more decisive: that love which unmistakably leads to the rational, in contrast with any corporeal affection involving self-love. There is a final classification of the rational as higher even than the moral: when the rational is quickened by spiritual love of goods and truths. Here, also, is a clue to all planes in man, his body, his rational, and his spiritual; with conjunction with the Lord as the highest good.\(^{458}\) The rational is still essential to the spiritual, as in other connections man must be sound in body to be of sound mind. The rational is here like a house built on a solid foundation: within the house are the treasures of the spiritual life, and conjunction with the Lord is: \textit{dwelling in it}.\(^{459}\)

Here, in fine, it is primarily a question of the truth, which is loved for the good. When goodness dominates, truth, as it were, disappears and becomes the good.\(^{459}\) The purpose of the rational is that everyone shall wish well and do well to another. Hence emphasis falls on interiors, on memory, and in other significant respects, in the light of profound adaptation to man’s spirit.\(^{460}\) The situation is simplified, also, by the fact that the will and understanding here posses the rational, with its rich complexities involving the entire sphere of human experience, the term “rational mind,” being the equivalent of will and understanding with respect to its distinct functions.\(^{461}\) The opening of the understanding is affected through influx into the rational—into the spiritual principle in what is rational in man.\(^{462}\)

The understanding differs from the rational because, through the latter, the successive states of the understanding are made explicit, and these states are described with reference to the accompanying states of will-love. For example, before a man has been regenerated, will does not act as one with understanding. Hence, the understanding may be studied separately, its endeavor
being distinguished from that of will. Yet, what is discriminated for the sake of analysis is seen in more intimate relation as we penetrate the selfhood of the internal man, distinguishing what is centrally intellectual and viewing this in the light of heaven (as reason). The more interiorly a man thinks, the more extension he has. Thus, our description finally includes man’s whole relation to the spiritual world. Here, too, will and understanding are seen in unison in the genuinely spiritual life. This union is the essence of rationality. We have here a complete conception of the rational mind. Rationality, in its fullness, is identical with the understanding in its grasp of the good and the true. But as rationality involves freedom, so understanding implies love. It is impossible adequately to describe the one without the other. The present exposition takes account of all that has been said about will and understanding in preceding chapters, while also anticipating a later discussion of freedom in which these principles will become still more explicit. Thus, the demonstration will become complete.

In the light of this intimate relation between will and understanding as constituting the rational mind, it is hardly necessary to undertake an analysis of truth. We have used the term from the first as the distinctive goal of the understanding, inseparable from the good, as the highest goal of will-love. Truth is not an end. It is for, from, and of the good as efficient and final cause. No truth can be produced unless there is a good from which it springs, or to which it leads. Truth is only the form of good, as faith is the form of love. Truth is formed from good according to the quality of the latter. The ideal is: truth and goodness made living or dynamic by Divine influx. Here truth is describable as full of spirit. Truth, then, becomes a receptacle adapted in its highest uses to the celestial. It has no life, but is from love and charity, as celestial.

Yet, for purposes of discrimination in relation to types of knowledge, truth can be (1) in the memory, as memory-knowledge; (2) rational, in the sense of memory-knowledges confirmed
by reason; or (3) intellectual, as conjoined with the internal perception “that it is so.” Whatever the sources of knowledge from the outside, there is an influx through heaven by an internal way which “continually meets the knowledges that are insinuated by means of the things of sense, and are implanted in the memory. Man is not aware of this intellectual truth because it is too pure to be perceived by a general idea. It is like a kind of light that illuminates the mind and confers the faculty of knowing, thinking, and understanding.”

We noted that “scientific truth” means “mere” knowledge, as an external possession subject to explanation and interpretation. But rational truth, as intermediate, is scientific truth confirmed by reason; while intellectual truth is internal and involves spiritual perception. Yet our analysis compels us to add that intellectual truth is in highest degree rational. For when we push the intermediate to the terminus, we come to reason itself. We need the classification of truths thus indicated, because truths as apprehended by the natural man, are merely doctrinal affairs in his memory, not yet appropriated or verified. Since these truths in their initial stage are founded on sensuous items or data, we do not attribute any more value to them than sense-deliverances warrant. But the “doctrinal” which the natural man apprehends and stores away in his memory are already in part interior truths intended for his real instruction, for example, truths from the literal sense of the word.

Thus, we are led back to the final source of truth—the Divine reason on which it is founded. Lest we should permit our investigation to lead too far into the abstractions of thought’s subtle analyses, we are reminded that “it is not in thought that the perfection of life consists, but in the perception of truth from the light of truth.” Faith is essential to truth, and confirmation of truth through faith and love is far higher than any mere investigation or analysis. To know that truth is true is of greater moment than to know what is true, but essential to this knowledge is the
assurance that it is true, with a persuasiveness which not only allays all doubts, but lifts this perception above processes commonly classed as cognitive. To know truths, to acknowledge them, and to have faith in them in this perceptive or illuminating sense, are three different stages in our intellectual progress. Man is born anew when he receives conscience by means of truths of faith; and this means, “hearing, acknowledging, and believing.” But even conscience is surpassed by celestial perception. The celestial degree is, in fact, inseparable from truth, and everything intellectual below it is a receptacle rather than a truth. Hence, the inferior place assigned to “knowledge” in this system.
There is little need in this doctrine for the term consciousness as traditionally used. The human self is not exalted into a position from which it may survey the world by regarding consciousness as the basis for philosophy. Hence, it is not necessary to attribute a portion of the conscious process to the participant self as “subject” or “ego,” by singling out another part as object or non-ego. Nor is consciousness central in the analysis of mind. The first emphasis is not on a “stream of thought” incessantly changing and disclosing various phases of the self so that self-consciousness shall lead to a long investigation by aid of introspection as a method. Despite the constant reference to inner states as discussed in Chapters I and II, this is not an introspective psychology in the sense in which self-study is sometimes paramount. The terms “internal” and “interiors” take the place of old-time references to subjectivity. There is no reason for either the usual analysis or the customary inferential synthesis; since doctrine has already shown what principles are first in rank, and self-analysis is not in any sense the primary source of knowledge.

Instead, consciousness means coming to judgment on such matters as self-love, the confirmation of falsities as if true; the acknowledgment of sin or evil for what it is, and the need for repentance, with reformation and regeneration as possibilities. So, the vital consideration is not the mental state a man is just now in, but the spiritual state that indicates his actual progress, if indeed he is really advancing. The passing mental states fail to show this spiritual status. Man is not aware by direct experience (or immediacy of feeling) of the Divine activity which makes
both his status and his series of mental states possible. No self-analysis would disclose the Divine efficiency. What is primary is never our own thought or awareness, however keenly we may scrutinize alternatives before we choose. By comparison the “stream of thought” is an appearance due to the more central activity of affections by which it is instilled than to thoughts from these affections which, speculatively speaking, seem so important.

Man is mostly unaware what impulses actuate him, what their social meanings are, and what his actual position is with respect to self-love and his equilibrium between the worlds. He is such an adept at self-justification that, if he tried to trace his combats to their source, his endeavors would not penetrate far. Only by correcting appearances, is it possible to pass beyond what we merely feel and think in terms of natural-mindedness. Suppression of our impulses would get us nowhere. Equally fruitless would be any mere analysis of what is nowadays termed the “unconscious” with its complexes, since no mere by-play could take the place of genuine acknowledgment of our motives with a view to real repentance. If the term “unconscious” be applicable in any sense, it would relate to the extensive sphere of activities which spiritual perception discloses. Our whole study is an enlightenment concerning man’s extremely limited awareness and the reasons for it. Hence, it is important to discriminate between current notions about the unconscious and man’s status as disclosed by the principles of influx, correspondence and degrees, all of which lie outside of man’s actual awareness.

Man does not, for example, know by experience what sphere the inmost occupies either in relation to the Lord or in the beginnings of his responsiveness to Love and Wisdom. His awareness is most keen in relationships susceptible of various interpretations. He does not consciously know that his sphere changes when his inner states change, when his ruling love contents with another type of affection. Such introspection, as he indulges in from time to time,
is most likely to plunge him the more deeply into the besetting self-consciousness from which he would be free, especially in case of individuals now classed as introverts. So, by introspection he is not made aware of the divergences between obsessing influences and those making for freedom when rightly construed. In general, he is ignorant of causes and must depend upon inferences based on appearances. He, of course, knows effects, but in the light of his relatively external interests, which may be traced to bodily or worldly sources but rarely indicate profound motives. Man especially needs enlightenment concerning the degrees of openness to influx that he may understand how the Divine can be in fullness in the outermost, contrary to what he might assume when judging by appearances as a merely conscious being. The degrees are, to be sure, opened according to man’s life, and some individuals might discern what others miss. But even this would be mostly in terms of actualities in this world, not “perceptively and sensibly” as a man could perceive in the spiritual world after enlightenment.\textsuperscript{468} For man, as we ordinarily find him, is not only unaware that he possesses two minds, two rationals, and two memories, but of the modes in which affection for goods and truths produces thought and perception. He is unaware what the understanding sees, and what it does not see.\textsuperscript{469} Hence, what he takes to be a “fact” depends on the extent of this greatly limited knowledge, memory-knowledge being that of his exterior memory. In brief, man is most aware of experiences in which he seems to use power unmistakably his own. Since he knows not otherwise from experience than that he thinks from himself, he is unaware of the fact that he has not so much as one idea, or even the fraction of an idea wholly his own, essentially from himself.\textsuperscript{470}

If man knew that the Divine leads him, in what manner influx operates from within, the continuity of the spiritual process would be disturbed; and man would endeavor to lead himself.\textsuperscript{471} The same would be true of his more intimate relation to his body. Man has no
knowledge from self-perception of the way his soul operates in the body. What he perceives is the inner conflict to which he is intermittently subject, not the forces in combat. He is unaware that these forces relate him to the spiritual world even in his diseases. Therefore, he does not know when and how adverse states in himself are reinforced from outside. Nor does he know that the solidarity of the race is an ideal fact in the Grand Man of the spiritual world. Some men are even unaware that they are in evils, combats, and temptations. The actual situation is that man’s interiors are in a kind of “unconscious activity” which would be discernible if his spiritual eyes were open.

After death any number of hidden states and processes will be disclosed. Man will then understand and speak the language of the spirit, inherent in everyone from creation. Until man comes to know his inner selfhood, he is likely to mistake infernal freedom for freedom itself. Ignorant of the “lusts of his evil,” he is at a loss to account for experiences entailing these impulses. Hence, heavenly doctrine is required for practical relationships to this world. The doctrine of Divine Providence is especially given as the interpretation of inner experience which, meager as actually perceived, is rich in meaning when spiritually understood.

On the background of this rich inner experience, it becomes possible to construe the “love for the sex” with its various functions which figure so prominently when it is a question of marital love in all its relationships. Love for the sex is, indeed, native and central. The psychoanalysts, following Freud, are right in making prominent the sexual nature as intimately related to the unconscious. But that “unconscious” is inaccessible save by a special technique based on the analysis of dreams and infantile sexualism; whereas the unconscious of our doctrine is not watched over by an alleged “censor,” implying inhibitions of conventional origin. There could be no critique adequate as a mere “censor,” warning man of adverse spheres likely to settle
upon him like a thief in the night, apart from spiritual perception of man’s entire inner life.

Knowledge of all the forces corresponding to the hidden “complexes” or repressions would be necessary. The focus of salient activities would not lie in the mere unconscious, but in the secret recesses of the soul, regions that are closed to analysts who deem even religion a great “delusion.”

The judgments of specialists concerning symptoms of hidden conflict is radically unlike our doctrine in a profoundly significant respect. This vital truth is given with respect to war. Since it is not from Providence that wars exist, there must be a profound reason for permitting them. On the human side, there is the significant fact that man wills to rule over others near at hand, hence over all men; to possess the world and eventually its wealth. No such rampant forces could be kept unbound. Furthermore, without permissions, no one could be led out of evils. It is, therefore, imperative that evils, seething beneath the surface, should be cast up that man may see them, discerning these evils to the core, acknowledging them for precisely the murdering, plunderings, cruelties, and violences which they are. If so minded, man may then will to have these evils cease. Evils could not be prevented by being shut in where, like cancer and gangrene, they would spread about and consume all that is vital in man. No man could be withdrawn from the hell of these evils unless he wished to be led out. War is only one instance of a general principle. Wars, lesser and greater, run through human existence. The law of Providence is the same for all. Repression is never the vital point. For what might be repressed within, there to work terrible havoc, is constantly being shown forth, in that Providence. The actuality is never really concealed. What is lacking is the true explanation of the series of changes, internal and external.
Man’s makeup is such that, what is rampant within, is always made manifest on the surface. But we need the clue to causality through knowledge of correspondences. Our insight would then point the way, not to the mere hidden condition popularly known as a “complex,” but to what Providence is doing so far as man responds. For we need to know more interior motives than the sexual, or any other motive disclosed by merely “making conscious” to the patient what has been suppressed.

Highly significant, indeed, is the little understood activity which casts to the surface what man needs to see in all its unconcealed baldness, that he may realize what is incumbent upon him if he would be free. To see and to understand is essential to the self-examination which is to follow. The repressions which entail vices, sins, and evils which should be exposed and recognized are not overcome by wrestling with symptoms, as if these had no right to exist, hence no spiritual meaning: nothing could be better for man than the exposures which they imply. Combats are more central than repressions, and central to these is man’s relation to the two worlds, with special reference to regeneration.

Combats arise all along the line: between the spiritual and the externals, and between the internals and externals of thought, while man is chiefly absorbed in externals, when contests with evils and falsities arise, when freedom is at stake, when the “life of the old man resists, and does not want to be extinguished.” Such combats also arise when man is being reformed, wrestling with temptations; when cupidities and falsities predominate, truth being that which fights and conquers. Specifically, combat arises “when a man thinks that evils are sins and therefore resolves to refrain from them; for when he refrains a door is opened, and when it is opened the Lord casts out the lusts of evil . . . and implants affections for good in their place.”\textsuperscript{477}
If a man were to examine appearances or externals alone, he would see only what is done, or not done; for example, that he has not committed adultery, murder, or theft, has not borne false witness; or, when he merely examines the evils of his body, his thoughts and intentions being neglected. Evils originate in lusts and enjoyments accepted and willed. Unless these were acknowledged for what they are, man would still be in the evils, although in externals he had not indulged in them. Plainly, goods and evils cannot coexist in man’s interiors. There is inherent in all evil a hatred of good. Man is unable wholly to be free from evils until, having both seen them in their baldness, and willed to have them cease, he also implores the Lord to help, meanwhile shunning and hating that to which he formerly succumbed. Since “no one can shun that of which he is ignorant, still less can he fight against it,” and since “no evil can be removed except by successive steps,” penetrative knowledge is required.

Vain indeed would be an appeal to any kind of so-called subconscious mind, whatever popular theory of its nature might be espoused. For on such a view the efficiency would be attributed to commingling or contending ideas, instead of the Divine influx. Mechanisms interacting by the laws of association would come no nearer. To claim that there is a “subjective mind” which carries out suggestions, answers prayers (prayer being autosuggestion), would still be to appeal to appearances. Any self-operating subconscious mind is mythical, as mythical as an appeal to “self-control” on the ground that mental changes of a personal sort are alone requisite, as if man could settle all the issues of rebirth on his own initiative, no higher power being necessary. When man thus asserts his independence as if rivaling the Infinite, his finitude is obvious indeed.

By contrast with such views, the doctrine that there is an inmost through which life inflows from the Divine shows that mind is dependent, and so limited that there is no ground for
the assumption that the processes within us are self-operative or mechanical. Furthermore, our mental life is not to be explained by assuming a shading-off into a psychical region, whether subconscious or super-conscious, to which our inspirations are due. The doctrine of discrete degrees runs counter to the idea of any such blending, particularly when it is a question of relationship to the Divine. If our mental states shade-off by becoming less conscious, this dim awareness is interpretable with respect to activities that have been going on, for example, when a process actively related to will and understanding has begun to go forth into conduct, most of the stages of which are hidden. The influx which is related to efflux is what is significant, not the mere idea or even the will-act. Many of our perceptions belong under the head of the less-conscious. The same is true of the results of our choices between emotions, of the decisions which have so much to do with the resulting moral changes.

What is to be guarded against is the notion that thought is either decisive rather than will, or so allied with an “infinite” or “universal” mind that man can, by affirmation, attract whatever he wishes. Also, to be avoided is the notion that thought can subconsciously control the body to bring about any desired condition, as if it could “function in the air” apart from the affections and the will. If no man “by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature,” or “turn one hair white or black,” there is much more that he cannot do. What thought can do is to aid in understanding what is spiritually possible in the Divine order. Granted this recognition of the Divine life, coming to us by no conditions which we can regulate, either to change or to accelerate, thought may indeed become affective in a secondary way. Here affirmation enters its true estate, conditioned in every respect by the incoming and assimilation of Divine influx, all negations having been removed.
If you love self, the world and worldly prosperity, your affirmation will then be due to your affections; the attendant affections will almost unwittingly spring into action to carry out your behests. You can, indeed, use mind in this way. Your subconscious will follow you like a shadow, unable as it is to do anything else (the body being “mere obedience”). But if love for the Lord is dominant, thoughts will still arise out of the affections, while the subconscious will still manifest obedience. Realizing that love with its servants rules in any event, you will naturally start on a higher plane, giving thought its higher use, what is subconscious being invariably instrumental only, never decisive or in itself directive. Angels will cease to be “our own good thoughts,” devils our adverse ones, and hell the mere torments of self-consciousness when we are unable to forget what we should face with open eye.

What is significant is not even the will of the moment alone, but also states of life which we have previously identified as ours, states which do not change unless love changes. These states are indeed mostly hidden, so far as passing thoughts are concerned. The life of man is not according to his consciousness alone, but according to his varying states in their succession. If we had a complete picture of whatever was significant that went before, we could put present consciousness in its true perspective. The present would often prove to be little more than an end-item, for example, when a man awakens to moral self-judgment and asks: “What has brought me to this pass?” Doctrine alone could supply what is crucial, in order to avoid undue stress on either the consciousness which the natural man is aware of, or the subconscious to which everything is nowadays attributed, which we cannot explain. It is out of the question, therefore, to envisage consciousness in its actual sphere apart from goods and truths, moral judgments, conscience, charity, faith and heavenly doctrine; since much depends on the state of life attained with respect to these principles. Inasmuch as all consciousness is dependent or
instrumental, it would be impossible to erect a system of reality by analyzing consciousness and proposing a philosophy to fit based on the inferences to be traced out. Even the inferences we draw depend on what we love, and what we love depends on what we are. There is a radical difference between inferences dependent on the salient facts of self-consciousness by adopting hypotheses to explain what we but dimly see, and increasingly acute awareness of what is significant due to love for doctrines acquired by spiritual perception. The sort of consciousness we cultivate depends, then, both on the end pursued and the means adopted for realizing our purpose. Love of Divine truth opens the way to a sphere of perceptions which clarify if we do not impose our own presuppositions (fallacies and falsities) upon the situation.
Chapter 27
Fallacies and Falsities

It follows from the doctrine of knowledge, as inclusive of the two worlds, that reality descends in the same scale: from Divine principles through the spiritual world to the natural, with its lower grade of reality, the sphere of effects. Spiritual reality is not more real simply because it is invisible, for it is also substantial. The human spirit, as substance, is profoundly real, far more real than substances in the natural world. Again, the states of the spirit are real. Around these states gather affections and thoughts constituting the little world of the individual spirit. In the experiences of the life after death, there are appearances in relation to reality, namely, appearances of space and time.

When we turn from the spiritual world to the natural, we observe that reality is described on its own plane about things embodying space and events requiring time. For the natural man, unaware that he is living in a realm of effects, space, and time are first in order of importance. So, for him, the chief contrast is between sense-experiences and mere fancies, and phantasms which prove to be mythical. The proof of the reality of a masonry wall, for example, is found by striking against the wall. In the gradation of knowleges and realities, it is necessary to have a way of distinguishing between appearances due to the existence of things in the natural world, and fallacies which relate to that world only.

For example, a sensuous phenomenon is any appearance with respect to things in space and time, as “things” are presented to our bodily senses. A fallacy may then be defined as a
misleading version of things as they appear, a misconception of error in contrast with a sense-perception that is true as far as it goes and is verifiable, as in striking a wall to prove that it is there. Our senses do not report the nature of things and events contrary to knowledge. They yield actual items for description and explanation. It is conceivable that the mind should report truly every fact of sense-experience. We would then have factual information ("scientifíc") concerning the existence of things around us, although still needing Divine truth in order to make right interpretations of even the simplest facts.

Obviously, the term appearance relates especially to externals, surfaces, and sensuous things. Yet appearances continue through all human experience. On each plane, there is a possibility of lapsing into fallacies, as in optical illusions and the misreading of pain localized around the heart. The essential consideration is the truth that, commingled with sense-perception as known in daily life, are factors of existence which do not know by experience, such as the presence of influx, without which our experience would be impossible.

We may define an appearance as anything or state as merely presented. Reality would then disclose that state or thing in the light of forces operating to produce it. Thus, our minds are not mere results of phenomena, but are real in relation to spirit as substance, and influx as the source of life. The more external the mind’s activity, the more its appearances are subject to correction. Natural knowledge must be corrected by spiritual truths. Phenomena play a part in awakening the "first rational." But the first items or facts are mere incentives. Far removed, indeed, is the spiritual light into which the mind is later elevated. The beginnings imply the merely natural light of untutored reason. Greatly superior to the "clouds," "veils," and "garments" of our memory-knowledges, are clear insights into truth at first discerned "as in a
glass darkly.” What is incumbent on us is persistence in penetrating mists peculiar to each stage of existence, that we may at last attain spiritual perception.

In contrast with appearances in the natural world which we all know, those of the spiritual world are described with reference to changing states of the inhabitants of that world. Such appearances are projections from within. With a change of attitude, thought, or affection, comes a change in the aspect of the surroundings. It is not appearance that is significant, but the series of states constituting the inner life of individuals whose changes are projected. The inner states may be compared with well-known facts in the natural world. It is a minor matter what scenery I travel through when in quest of life’s realities. What does signify is what I experience, think, will, and love as I proceed on my journey. Life will take on a different aspect for me wherever I am, if I am growing in enlightenment. It will change more intensively when reformation begins. There will then be a new series of spiritual states through which I shall judge the world of my daily environment. Space and time, as such, will be of secondary import. My experience here among hard-and-fast “things” prefigures my experience of the spiritual world yet to come, where appearances will also be secondary to what is momentous in its sequences.

The term fallacy is used in part as in our ordinary speech, with reference to matters that seem obvious when attention is called to them. For example, the notion that (1) the sun revolves around the earth; (2) that there is only a single atmosphere, that this is merely successively purer from one portion to another, and that where the atmosphere ceases there is a vacuum; or (3) that the growth of plant-life from seed to maturity is a property impressed on the vegetable world from the first creation.\textsuperscript{480} It is also declared to be a fallacy that there are simple substances in the form of monads and atoms as the constituents of things.\textsuperscript{481} It is a “fallacy of merely natural
sense” that all existent things are produced out of, and by “nature.” For nature is not an originating power or fundamental reality. All naturalistic evolutionisms are falsities.

More serious is the fallacy that only the body lives and that life ceases with death. This fallacy is due to total ignorance of the truth that the internal principle imbues the external, also the truth that the internal man will live after the body. From this fallacy there follows the one that man cannot survive death any more than beasts can, as if man had no higher principle in him, no power to meditate on the causes of death, and no ability to be conjoined with the Lord through faith and love by receiving influx as if it were his own. From this fallacy readily follows the notion that the soul is merely an ethereal or flame-like entity dissipated when death occurs; also the notion that the soul resides in heart and brain only, ruling the body as if it were a mere machine. The corrective has been given in a previous chapter: the internal resides in every part of the external although hidden from the eyes of sensuous man.

Related to these fallacies is the assumption, due to misinterpretation of sense-experience that light and heat can come from no other source than that of the sun, or elementary fire. Here the offsetting truth is that light in the sense of intelligence, and heat in the sense of love also exist, though outside of physical apprehension. It is from a fallacy of sense-life that man believes he lives from himself, or that life has been imparted to him so that it is his own.

Granted such fallacies, man in his sensuality readily claims the right to do what he likes, for example, in his adulteries; various attendant fallacies easily follow. To offset these notions one needs doctrine, for example, regarding marital love as spiritual. Fallacies with respect to pleasure follow from the notion that heaven is like an earthly dominion, with self-love and love of worldly power dominant. So, too, it is easy to assume that good works merit reward as we judge earthly rewards, on the assumption that to benefit another for the sake of self is a good
work. As readily, some people have assumed that man is saved by faith alone, according to Protestant dogma. The central difficulty is that, under dominion of the sensuous, man is enveloped in darkness, mistaking what is obscure for rationality.

To be immersed in sensuous things is to think from the sensuous. Consequently, man then thinks habitually from fallacies.\textsuperscript{482} Thus, he naturally regards his life as of the body and assumes that his sense-organs perceive. So, too, life seems to be in a state of permanence, instead of constantly flowing in. Identifying himself with his body, he does not know that the real man is a soul in human form. Thence follow the fallacies that heaven is a \textit{place} “above” and hell a region “below.” Thus, man is far from the truth with respect to the beginnings of heaven and hell in his inner life.

Man as readily comes by the fallacy that objects flow into the exteriors of the mind, in contrast with the truth that internal activity makes sense-perception possible. Any psychology is fallacious which starts by assuming that sense-perception is primarily due to stimuli produced from without by the action of objects upon the organism, when the influx is from interiors to exteriors and, by means of this influx, into sense-perception.\textsuperscript{483}

If we understand the cardinal error, we see the corollaries, and the development of the whole fallacious theory. Then, we see why falsities have dominion instead of truth. Thus, we can clarify the old-time dispute over the circulation of the blood, about the seat of the soul, and its conjunction with the body.\textsuperscript{484} Granted this clue, we see how readily men fell into error concerning heaven, before correspondences were understood.

It is not, of course, to be denied that stimuli from the world around us arise in our sense-organs on the occasion of external occurrences, such as the first appearance of the direct rays of the sun above the horizon, or that memory-images survive to give the mind subject-matter. What
is denied is that the sense-process can be primarily explained in this way. It is pointed out, in
general, that mere appearances blind the understanding, that an appearance confirmed becomes a
fallacy, and to become confirmed in a fallacy is to adopt a naturalistic point of view, as if
spiritual causes did not exist.\textsuperscript{485}

As above indicated, fallacies are usually due to erroneous notions concerning physical
things. Errors of this sort which infect our judgment and distort our beliefs are known as falsities.
A falsity may be a persuasion based on distortions of doctrine, or alleged scientific knowledge;
or, it may be based on cupidities and evil desires. A circle of unfortunate influences is implied.
Evil in general, confirmed by fallacies and falsities, is itself a falsity underlying other falsities.
Granted the initial falsity, evil can be as readily confirmed as good.\textsuperscript{486} Once confirmed, a man
finds reasons to sustain it. All the foregoing fallacies, for instance, may be drawn upon to
substantiate the falsity in question.

There are two general sources of falsities, however. Those derived from ignorance are not
so pernicious.\textsuperscript{487} Much subtler are those arising from evil desires. The falsities on which evils are
founded are, indeed, forerunners. Evil produces characteristic falsities, and there must always be
false subject-matter to imbue evil from lower knowledges.\textsuperscript{488} Evil would not thrive without
falsities. Thus, evil in the will is turned into falsity in the understanding. But, more explicitly,
falsities are due to cupidities. Falsity is whatever gives assent to, or favors, the given cupidity.\textsuperscript{489}
A cupidity inevitably produces falsities, as we observe, when a man is given over to avarice and
uses his mentality to support slavish desires.

Some falsities are known as intellectual persuasions because they take possession of the
understanding only.\textsuperscript{490} These are from a falsity already established in oneself. Hence, the
distinction between falsities springing directly from cupidities of the will and those received
from principles of the understanding which may draw upon all kinds of fallacies.\textsuperscript{491} Thus, a false doctrine may be the chief support of an intellectual falsity. Men are in all sorts of falsities from birth due to hereditary evil.\textsuperscript{492}

Indeed, the twofold classification of (1) falsities due to ignorance; and (2) falsities due to cupidities implying loves of self and the world, must now be enlarged by the later classification.\textsuperscript{493} Falsities are due to (1) doctrines of the Church—these are manifold in falsities, as shown by \textit{The True Christian Religion}; (2) fallacies of the senses, already described; and (3) the life of cupidities, or evil desires, to be presently described.\textsuperscript{494} Falsities from doctrine take hold of the understanding only. Those from fallacies of the senses pertain, as we have seen, to what is sensuous in man’s reasoning. But falsity from cupidity attacks the will itself, since man inwardly desires the experience in question. The falsity then sinks in, inhering in the life, as in a person confirmed in adultery. Nothing short of new life from the Divine can eradicate such a falsity. The understanding is involved too. For, when man wills from falsity and cupidity, he thinks about and confirms it intellectually. Thus, falsity may take on the appearance of truth, since the light of heaven is shut out. Fortunate, indeed, is the man who has not confirmed his falsities “in himself,” for in that case, truths previously taken into the understanding resist the encroachment of falsities.

The process of assimilating into oneself is called appropriation, which leads to confirmation. This process is unfortunate in case of evils and falsities, fortunate when goals and truths are taken to heart.

It is to be observed that, although prone to falsities, man never loses the capacity to think soundly. He may, however, pervert the lower functions of his understanding and give a twist to his mentality so that he thinks unsoundly while under that ruling state.\textsuperscript{495} Whatever principles
have been adopted, even the falsest, rule the man as long as he is under their dominion. This means that all higher points of view are closed. For no one can apprehend higher matters from lower ones.

Knowledge of the fundamental falsity is of great moment, namely the notion that man lives from himself.\textsuperscript{496} Granted this notion, a man readily appropriates evils and other falsities. Many consequences then ensue. Why is it imperative to put such emphasis on this falsity? Because man from himself is “dead,” and nothing which he produces from himself can be good. To destroy falsities at their source is to see anew that man shares or participates in life, but does not originate it.

Obscurities

Very important is knowledge of obscure states which beset man’s way from the first moment a contrast or antithesis enters his mind. We have found one reason for obscurity, in general, in the fact that man is mostly unaware of forces that play upon him and of elements of his nature which attract and repel. Every fallacy and falsity are, of course, an obscurity. Moreover, man is born with an adverse heredity since his ancestors have perverted their love-nature. Born into the opposite of order, man is born into darkness. In this inverted state, man’s view of life is greatly obscured. But, as if this were not enough, his natural mind readily mistakes appearances for reality. So, it starts amiss. Indeed, humans have been in an obscure state since man became external in his attitudes, interests, and loves. The individual is born and reared in an atmosphere which he readily intensifies by the two loves which arise through obscurity. It is no wonder that man is sometimes described as “confused and obscured.”\textsuperscript{497}
Unconscious as man is of the radical difference between forces making evil, it is not strange that he falls into fallacies, thence into falsities, which he confirms with eagerness. He does not know that his whole spiritual advance is hampered by an adverse element of will, and that there is also an adverse element (proprium) which gives the understanding a natural bent towards falsities and their attendant obscurities. This situation with the understanding is intensified by the fact that the will-element, which “pours into the intellectual part what is obscure and false,” beclouds the mind so that falsities obscure truth in general.498

One would naturally suspect that, while man is in the body, corporeal and worldly occupy his thoughts induce obscurity. For while man is in his body, he feels “very obscurely the things which come forth in his spirit.” We would also anticipate the possibility that a man may “confirm himself in what is false as if true.” For the natural man, in general, is enveloped in obscurities because he is in the light of the world, the “ultimates” which surround him, being no less obscure. But we may not have realized that “all the good which flows with light from the Lord is terminated in the obscurity of man.”499 Any understanding, in fact, which is not “illustrated” by heavenly influences, is likely to be in obscurity. One who is given over to external worship is also in an obscure state. All appearances due to merely human thought and affection are obscurities. Great, indeed, is the obscurity besetting man prior to his regeneration. But even in a regenerated man, the perception of goods and truths is obscured.500 There is obscurity after temptation and amidst temptation because of evils and falsities besetting man. Obscurity attends us just before death. Two types of obscurity, in fact, beset us to the end of all processes involving the merely human self: (1) natural density, when man’s thought is from sensuous light; and (2) spiritual obscurities from (a) the falsity of evil; (b) ignorance of the truth; and (c) exterior things influencing interior.501
For the moment the situation looks so dark that we wonder how Divine Providence can ever penetrate the human spirit. But the reason for this extreme emphasis is that man must realize he is in darkness because he does not receive the light of heaven, everywhere shining so that he might bask in its warm rays and participate in the opportunities which it discloses. We need also to see how to pass out of obscurities. Negations having been driven away, the affirmative attitude having displaced the negative, doubts will go, and the darkness will disappear. The spiritual man can come from obscurity into light whenever he thus turns about, in a favorable attitude. So, too, the clouds which beset our thought in reading the Bible will be dissipated when we penetrate the letter of the Word to its inner meaning.

Obscurity is thus a term replete with ideas for those in earnest in penetrating to the core of adverse influences surrounding the mind. It is always a question of contrasts. What to the natural man is light, is darkness to the spiritual. Life in the world may seem delightful to a spirit so bound that there is no light save “natural lumen.” When every thought “flows into natural ideas,” the mental states are dense in comparison with “thought with the spirit”: when ideas derived from space and time give place to thought from spiritual perception. Gross, indeed, are many thoughts, blinded as we are, “incapable of receiving innumerable things that pertain to spiritual thought.” Dark, indeed, is our state when worldly cares break in upon us. But it is everything to know the situation as it is, to see that bondage inevitably brings states of obscurity.

Confirmation

Plainly, there is a difference between mere ratiocination (involving the first rational), and reason in the better sense of the term. Under the former head belongs what is popularly known today as “rationalization,” namely persuading oneself, excusing, and attempting to justify on
whimsical and superficial grounds. The tendency to establish in mind what we thus convince ourselves of is confirmation, which may be defined as the process by which man corroborates and takes to himself sensuous and other natural matters, also falsities and evils. In the better sense of the term, confirmation proceeding from particulars to generals helps man to realize truths in relation to love and charity. But the tendency to hasty generalization plays havoc in all sorts of doctrines concerning the soul, the spiritual life and God, and doctrines found on the slimmest basis of fact or reason.

The mind is habitually prone to confirm any belief to which we take a fancy, any so-called fact or experience adopted as significant without examination. For the time being, appearance becomes as real as life itself. Thus, a fallacy becomes fixed as a falsity, while a falsity becomes so established that it is adhered to like true doctrine. The obscurities amidst which we live and think are such as to render a fallacy or falsity probable. So, too, obscurities favor evil, therefore, readily following from a falsity. Granted insight into this process, much light is thrown upon the nature of evil.

Investigation shows that this tendency to confirm what we adopt depends on our attitude toward the matter in question in the beginning. For instance, we sometimes decide in advance what we will believe, and what we will not investigate, because it conflicts with what we have previously assumed and confirmed ourselves in. What follows, will depend on what we have already assumed. Having adopted certain opinions, we permit any new evidence to strengthen what we have already assumed. Thus, we continue from bondage to bondage, and become opinionated or conservative.

Thus, the general “man is governed by the principles he assumes,” whether true or false. Then he brings to bear his knowledge and reasoning in confirmation. Many considerations
readily occur to mind to support what has been assumed. Hence, man confirms himself in what is false. Again, he may have agreed with himself so to speak that he will not believe anything concerning heavenly matters save what can be seen and understood by the same modes he adopts regarding things perceived through the bodily organs. Or, a man may find confirmation of what he chooses to believe in matters cherished in his exterior memory. On the other hand, he may have decided to accept higher enlightenment, may hold all matters in reserve that are not yet substantiated by Divine evidences. A man’s cardinal conviction may be to believe the Word first, last, and always. He who desires to be enlightened in a chosen direction will open his mind in that direction, excluding other sources.

When a man is intent on an article of faith, he makes this interest his chief one. This is especially the case when his imagination claims this item. When loves of self and the world enter the situation, the case becomes stronger. Everything that occurs seems to agree with and confirm it. At last, man will swear that it is so. Thus, faith can be made to seem more essential than love.

The more a man is under self-love, the more resolutely he will hold to what he is persuaded of, and has confirmed, so that it is a part of himself. Thus, man is confirmed in a life of desires, although the evidences upon which he draws are falsities. What man adopts by thus dwelling on it, becomes a matter of habit. It is even easier to become confirmed in a falsity than in a truth. For the falsity is more gratifying through what it emphasizes in a man’s favorite affections. The ingenious man is so able to confirm a falsity that pleases him as to pass among his comrades as intelligent.

The vital point in all this is that, what is confirmed by both will and understanding, endures to eternity, whereas that which has been confirmed by the understanding only can be
effaced. To confirm a falsity is to deny a truth. So, too, when we confirm ourselves in evil, we deny the human self at its best. The man who adopts such a falsity, so that he makes it part of his attitude by putting his will into it, confirming it as his habitual outlook on the spiritual life, sets himself against the good which would result were her to adopt the conviction that man has no goodness, love, or wisdom, except from the Lord. The latter attitude would then become his confirmed inner state.

What a man thinks and does in freedom, appropriating his thought and deed as his own, remains with him. Thus, a man may take into his heart what he sincerely believes. What a man thus identifies with himself, is what he readily confirms, not what he professes with his lips or permits to appear through his bodily behavior. The good that a man receives from glad acceptance of an opportunity for service, is so intimately appropriated, that nothing can eradicate it. Thus, good confirmation is greatly to be depended upon. The will to accept is decisive. Unless we will enter a thing, we do not appropriate it. What we heartily make our own in this way we tend to manifest in our deeds.
Chapter 28
The Function of Desire

The study of falsities, and the habit of confirming what we believe in a self-justifying way, brings our study to the consideration of some of the sources of falsities, notably those which belong under the head of desire. In other chapters, we have guarded against the notion that simple states or processes combine by self-acting evolution to produce will, understanding, and their derivatives. We have rejected the view that subsequent tendencies of which we become conscious, are due to instinct in the popular sense of the term. The doctrine subordinates association and habit as supposedly explanatory. And we have traced activity to its spiritual sources. We may now follow the direct clue and describe desire as a form of activity, an urge, or endeavor, secondary to will and understanding, although desire plays an important part in mental life. We all know something about desire from experience. What we need is a way to classify its modes in relation to higher and lower activities.

In recent psychology, desire under the guise of “conation” (striving) has been distinguished from cognition, or the knowing process, and from will. In some systems emotion (and feeling), conation, and cognition are deemed the three elementary principles. Thus “being affected,” striving and knowing are put forward as the processes which lead to all other phases of mental activity. More recent psychologists use the term “drive” to represent this impelling or out-reaching side of our nature: each cardinal tendency is said to have an “urge” or impulse which spurs on towards behavior. Sometimes there is said to be a cosmic urge reproducing itself
in everyone, a native prompting which enables man to participate in the creative opportunities of the world. Will-to-power is still another equivalent, also *libido* or the sexual (biological) urge as described by the psychoanalysts. In any case, the emphasis falls on a dynamic principle, due to native trends, in contrast with habit as acquired.

The preceding chapters have disclosed a kind of faculty which is unlike a passive receptacle although this term is used, also the term “containant.” In our doctrine, emphasis falls on influx. The human spirit is reactive or responsive to influx rather than being merely receptive. Furthermore, will and understanding rank above all urges or the sense of effort (conation). Endeavor or effort may be allied with any desire or striving and is not decisive. Motion might be aroused by it, but everything would depend on the direction thus given. With thought and will cooperating, such striving might, indeed, go forth into effective deeds. Without the initiating effort there could be no motion. When the effort ceases, the motion ceases. Every volition (will-act) in man is a “living endeavor” toward some end which man longs to attain. The effort is based in the fibers and nerves. The perpetual endeavors which underlie action are from the beginnings of motion in the brain. Thus, by successive stages of which we are unaware, our intentions are eventually carried into the sphere of behavior (as external). These are points left unexplained in other types of psychology.

Although, as we have before noted, Swedenborg used conation with reference to cosmical forces in his earlier period, in these doctrines the primacy is given to the graduated descent of life which meets the deliverances of sense-perception. Effort or endeavor thus finds its secondary place as an expression of will-love, as the real source of all human striving: love unceasingly strives toward its end. Will is excited and determined into definite acts by love which flows into and causes will to make effort. The efficacy resides therefore in love, whereas
in ordinary psychology, the dynamic is attributed to external forces, man being little more than an organism for behaving in various modes.

There is a perpetual endeavor of man towards evil. This impetus is sustained by affections which connect man with the external world, and are allied with the so-called carnal mind, suggestive of human passions in their most intense modes. But man’s endeavors also imply a striving to actualize goods and truths as goals of all worthy effort. Indeed, man’s selfhood is, in part, formed through constructive efforts of will and thought. There is an effort of both will and understanding toward realization of man’s higher self. On the biological level, man endeavors to propagate the species and such endeavors have their “urge.” Hence, the significance of the term “biological urge,” so often used nowadays in place of “sexual instinct.” Thus, all endeavors function on the plane in question, and it would be absurd to neglect these levels, as if the libido (biological energy) were the only power. On the highest level, the Divine activity includes promptings for our welfare and preservation, with guidance favoring reformation and regeneration, in Divine Providence.

There are distinctions then between (1) Divine endeavor which continually makes effort in our behalf, restraining us when necessary, and permitting what is granted for the sake of the lesson it may teach; (2) human endeavor by which we respond to Divine influx, including our highest incentives to love truth and seek good; and (3) efforts due to self-love in its impulse to become all-powerful even at the risk of descending into evil. Whether the efforts of self-love in its ability to block Divine influx provoke trouble and plunge man into misery are in any sense hereditary is another question. The significant fact in the present stage of our study is that, even in man’s native endeavor, with the several desires springing there from, there is a tendency to try in two directions because man is actuated by two loves and their affections. Granted choice of
heavenly affections, the Divine influx enters cooperation with man’s endeavors, reinforcing his effort to make it successful and enabling him to conquer adverse desires. Thus, man can abstain from evils *as if* from himself. With freedom and rationality as the basis of this will, endeavor comes into play as essential to the efficacy of such decisions. If the endeavor were a striving like animal instinct, it would not be “alive.” Man’s effort gives dynamic evidence of his intention to achieve worthy ends, in order to enlist Divine cooperation. This impulse toward effective changes in daily life is especially noteworthy when a doctrine meets with man’s approval. Otherwise, endeavor would have remained merely general.

The appropriate term with respect to endeavor as essential to the continuation of nature’s processes is “force.” Man is actuated by so many forces from the outside that what is imperative is realization of the greater nearness of the endeavors implied in Divine influx meeting physical forces from without. If external forces seek to win him through appeal to his love of power, internal power seeks to win him too. In either case, the influences on which man is subject are intelligible in terms of the *end* sought through him.\(^{511}\) The full force of the effort man is able at his best to make is seen only when will is united with understanding. Knowledge of the nature of endeavor is essential to insight into this union.

Since Divine influx seeks ends through what is outermost, there is an endeavor indwelling in what is most external in our nature and our bodily behavior toward those ends.\(^{512}\) We are not limited to cooperation with Divine endeavor from within-outward. We may also do our best to make our external life, its forms, and behavior in the body, a fit vehicle for the endeavor residing in it. Even spiritual endeavor needs a practical organism for reducing what is general to the concrete. Not until we make actual effort to carry out what we believe, do we
realize half the obstacles besetting our way. We have a different appreciation of spiritual truths when we try to make them our own through actual contest with our desires.

The indwelling or latest endeavor, when aroused into action, takes on specific forms. Each of these expressions is a desire. A desire is an urge of natural affection or appetite, as in the desire for food. Our carnal desires might be taken as signs that we are already in evil. Thus, desire may find its form through an impetus to take revenge, defame, blaspheme, or commit a forbidden act. Hence, the discrimination of desires will depend upon the kind of bodily behavior which expresses the urge in question. Desire obviously covers a wide range, from the most sensual to the most spiritual. If we clearly see that desire is an expression of an affection—that affection is carried into conduct by means of endeavor, and that choice between affections is essential to worthy endeavor—we need not analyze desires in detail. Moreover, we have seen that affections with their tendencies imply a ruling passion, which is more central than desire. Desires by themselves often seem in hopeless conflict. The situation is greatly simplified when all desires are reduced to two types with respect to the loves they manifest.

In current psychology, desire is described with reference to the bodily impulse which brings it into action. But as our impulses, lower and higher, depend on the type of ruling love, it is not necessary to analyze impulses as if these were prior to affections. Our impulses may be generous, kind, and expressing love to the Lord and the neighbor; or mean, ungracious, and expressive of hate. We naturally weigh them in our scale of higher and lower affections. It is a question of motives and their expression in characteristic deeds.

Cupidity
The term cupidity becomes intelligible when we distinguish between superior and inferior desires. A cupidity is a typical lower or evil desire. It embodies a desire for what a man loves, coupled with the delight he takes in it under the notion that he is free.\textsuperscript{515} Hence it involves misapprehension if not a falsity. The two most common cupidities pertain to love of self and love of the world. Cupidities arise when man, self-guided, consults the series things of life and the world, draws upon his memory-knowledges in matters of belief, and falls into doubt, denial, fantasy and filthy loves. There is no will to do good in a cupidity.\textsuperscript{516} There is false incentive to action from false belief, which, in turn, is chiefly due to self-love.

There is another side to this situation. A man may be led and bent to what is good by his cupidities.\textsuperscript{517} The Lord does not extinguish our cupidities, for they are identified with our love. If our cupidities were taken from use, even thought itself would cease.\textsuperscript{518} Combats and temptations arise in relation to such desires. Through these conflicts, man’s spiritual nature can be appealed to and quickened. Man’s cupidities are first among the obstacles to be mastered in the advance toward spiritual realities, for the natural man is chiefly composed of them. During regeneration, these cannot be abolished in a moment, for then the whole man would be destroyed.\textsuperscript{519} Indeed, cupidity in the more inclusive sense is “man himself,” inasmuch as man cannot do what is good of himself. It is man in this respect who needs to be enlightened and regenerated.\textsuperscript{520} While in the external man cupidities and their consequences (chiefly falsities) prevail, in the internal man there are remains of spiritual goods and truths, hence, there is a basis for regeneration.

Man is in a state of bondage while cupidities and falsities are in command. To this extent, cupidity means perversion of good. But that which has been perverted can be reclaimed. Man’s cupidities are to be mastered, not exterminated. Putting this otherwise: man’s natural desires serve ends in their proper places; while a natural desire carried to excess became a cupidity and
is reinforced by evil affections. When, too, a natural desire is intensified by a false belief, it becomes a cupidity. If the excesses were removed, the natural desires would be restored. This restoration would involve, in part, the removal of fantasies. Since man desires only what he loves, with a change of love a consequent change in the desires will follow.

Lust

Hell may be described as a form of lusts of man’s evil, lust being a more intense cupidity. Imperative for man is knowledge of the fact that, what he perceives is not cupidity, or lust, as such but enticing enjoyment. Man must then learn to see through the devices of his lust, that he may realize what is active within his more intense desires. Since lusts block the way and even close the door to Divine influx, there is every reason to contrast them with their opposites: love toward the Lord and man. Lusts beset even the interiors of the mind and flow from the interiors into the body, where they excite unclean tendencies which titillate the fibers. Man should therefore know in what way evils in the external relate to lusts of evil in the internal. Granted this knowledge, man has a clue to the mastery of cupidities, through insight into the sphere of desire.

Concupiscence

In everything which proceeds from the natural man there is concupiscence and lust. Due to delight in inferior loves, the bodily fire, concupiscence is an intense cupidity allied with affections of evil and diseases. A cupidity, a sensuous or evil desire, becomes a concupiscence when it dominates a man’s activity so that he not only seeks sensuous gratification, but seeks to gain possession of the property of others. Concupiscence thus has its delights. Its rule may even extinguish the hold which goods and truths have on him through faith. Covetousness is
the direct clue to these most intensive cupidities. What we covet is, to this extent, a concupiscence, as in extreme love of the world for possessions one may take to oneself. Covetousness is evil desire; hence it is concupiscence, which pertains more to will than to understanding. A man must beware when he loves things lest, in making them objects of will, he should covet his neighbor’s goods, and so permit desire to increase and become concupiscence. The sorrows of hell await one whose desires are intensified by lusting after and by desiring to despoil. Even the will becomes evil, especially through these promptings that defile a man: incentives to murder, commit adultery, fornication, theft, or to bear false witness.

It is well to consider the possibility that evil desires intensified in this way may remain with a man after death, even when the inciting activities are removed. If, however, a man who is battling his evil desires does not will them and does not desire to commit the evils, but rejects them as sins, when the mind’s externals are removed, the man is free. The crucial point is this: “as long as man is in evils, he is in the love of them, for he longs after them.” It is when the natural mind is considered from the point of view of its evils and consequent falsities that it is said to be a form and image of hell. This is another way of putting stress on self-love. When cupidities and passions of the lower mind correspond to diseases, they misuse or pervert life superior in origin so that this life is turned into what is contrary. But, once more, these desires take their cue from the man, and “man” is here self-love. Concupiscence is, in brief, an extreme form of the sensual proclivities which tend to dominate a man’s life when he gives himself over to evil. We may then use “evil desire” to cover the whole class of cupidities.

Man’s desires are so numerous and intense that it is difficult to generalize. It is important to signalize each one if we can; for other desires will not take wing and trouble us no more simply because we have detected one adverse desire and set our will against it. Each has its
source and objective. Only seldom is life so limited that we can describe our whole existence in terms of a dominant desire, as the miser desires and does little save to count his gold. Although there may be but few unfavorable desires, each should be faced and admitted. None can be ignored. If we would know why many good intentions pass without leaving any result, we will find the answer by learning to what extent we still live in desires, despite all protestations in favor of ideals.

Desires and affections are so intimately connected that we may well envisage them together as constituting the little world of our prevailing love, which may loom large in comparison with our intellectual life. A certain amount of realism is needed before we are ready for the idealism of a higher love. Good resolutions do not work like magic to ferret out evil desires and spare us the trouble. Nor are we rid of desires by classing them as negative, our ideals being positive. Nothing is more positive in our primitive makeup than desire.

Unless man was originally a creature of desire, he would not provide food, clothing, and shelter; he would not seek a mate, would not congregate with and propagate his kind. Indeed, we must be fairly loaded down with desire. But so strong is this native desire that, when love in higher forms arises into power, man is thrown into the long-drawn-out process of conflict from which people are still emerging when they wonder why spiritual doctrine plays so small a part in their conduct. Since our desires are with us to stay, it is a question of seeing the process through to the end, till we realize the power of a wise prevailing love. If we have given recognition to desires in rightful places, we need not give special thought to repressions or complexes.

The Ruling Love
To study mental life to discover what element of our nature is central, is to learn the significance of interests, intentions, and motives traceable to the affections implied in them, as in the pursuit of success, fame, wealth, and power. What concerns me as particularly mine thus becomes prominent. Thus, the ruling affection is that love which a man adopts as his end, to which many affections are subordinate, so that the dominating love is in all the derivative affections, directing them, and using them as means. Self-leadership, for example, may be prominent. Impelled by this motive, men will consult memory-knowledges to see what to believe that will foster self-guidance. The result is a claim that one’s eyes are open, that one is competent to know good and evil, also able to excel in worldly learning.

Self-love is also evident through neglect of the neighbor, and disregard of the public through conceit, pride, avarice, envy, hatred, revenge, and unmercifulness. The same motive may also underlie actions undertaken (ostensibly) for the sake of one’s wife, children, and family connections who, by extension, are one with the man thus motivated. So far as a man really is in love of self, whatever the appearances, to this extent he removes himself from the love of his neighbor, so from heaven, with a tendency toward hell, as self-love at its maximum. The psychological clue is in the enjoyment, the ostensible reason covering a multitude of affections involving self-love.

All love tends to conform either to this type, or to love of the neighbor and the Lord. Man is such as his ruling love. As the love, so the life. As the life, so the whole man in soul and body. His ruling love is man’s “very will”—the end of which he pursues in multitudes of acts. Hence, the quality of a man’s love determines the quality of every thought and deed manifesting his life. A man’s delights are really those of his ruling love, even when these enjoyments seem to be ends in themselves. The ruling love is the “veriest form of the spirit and all the rest of its
In fine, the ruling love constitutes a man’s sphere, extending itself according to quality and quantity. This central love rules in the sense that it *makes the man*, dominates as love of the object which man has as his end.

Since love determines what each man pursues as his goal, however he may indulge in self-deception or excuses, it is safe to infer that it is self-love, because of man’s proneness for seeking what is his own until he is spiritually enlightened. A man may ostensibly love his neighbor or the good. But the process is the same: the dominion of his love is beyond doubt. A marked instance is seen in those who so love the world and so desire power that the interiors are closed to heaven. This amounts to the denial of Divine truths. Man does not, while in such a state, seek or intend to seek anything whatever that is Divine. The principle is that “love receives every thought which is in agreement with itself.” Every love wants to be nourished by its own motives and interests.\(^{534}\)

It might be said that love described as dominant self-interest is not really love. This is true if we limit the term to love’s essence as spiritual. “It is the essence of love not to love self, but to love others and to be conjoined with others by love.” Further, love consists in this, that its own should be another’s. In this sense, love is the antithesis of all desire to possess. So, from the viewpoint of joy, to feel the joy of another as in oneself is the true motivation. In this sense love is manifold. Its varieties are endless, heavenly love being the test in loving what is good, honest, and just, and doing this through love for the Lord and the neighbor. Such love in conduct or life is what endures. Love thus regarded, is inseparable from wisdom.

Yet, such love is an ideal. The fact remains that “every man is his own love.” This trend toward ‘ownhood’ is so strong that only through profound contrast does man at length realize the power and beauty of that affection which wills to give even his own to another. The spirit of man
is his ruling love, or selective principle, and man needs to know his spirit down to the foundation
that he may grow into preference for a heavenly “own.” Not at once does man realize that “love
apart from wisdom, or will apart from understanding, cannot think anything, nor can it see or feel
anything.” Love is the dynamic without which men put forth extremely little effort to gain
what they appear to desire. The problem is to enlist man’s affections in an enterprise for the good
and the true.
Chapter 29
Feeling

The fine distinctions characteristic of this psychology are brought clearly before us by a comparison between other teachings and usages and the terms here employed. It was customary, for example, to divide the human mind into three faculties known as feeling, thought, and will. The term “feeling” covered the whole field of sensations, perception, emotion, pleasure, and pain. It was even extended to include consciousness as well as “self-feelings,” identified with self-consciousness. Hence, feeling was equivalent to immediate awareness in any direction, and “bodily feelings” were contrasted with self-feelings.

Ordinary speech still conforms to this usage. Instead of saying “I think,” “I judge,” “I am inclined to believe,” or “I agree,” we say indiscriminately “I feel.” We refer to feeling and consciousness as one and the same, as if consciousness did not include discrimination. Very few distinguish between thought and feeling, still less, between emotions and feelings. Feeling in general is whatever is nearest to us. We even extend it to include intuition and faith, our private convictions, and the thoughts we keep to ourselves. It might seem absurd to protest this vagueness, but we find reasons for being extremely careful in the use of such a term as feeling, when employing it would cause one to lapse into fallacies and falsities, to the neglect of the entire doctrine of degrees, correspondences, and influx.

The psychology of the last few decades is more precise than popular speech. Starting with sensation and sense-perception, as distinguished from feeling in its vagueness, recent psychology contrasts sensations of reds and blues, for example, with discords and harmonies,
sweetness or sourness, as feeling-tones associated with sense-experiences. Thus, the blue object may be pleasing, the discords painful, and the sour morsel repellant. Naturally, our feeling-reactions belong under two heads at least: feelings of pleasure or of pain. Thus, feeling properly so-called indicates the way we are affected by experience. Feeling ceases to be a “faculty.” It does not occupy the same place as thought and will. The trained psychologist tries to say what he means, instead of vaguely saying, “I feel.” This is an admirable example if we shall avoid lapsing into falsities, then confirming them because they gratify us through the pleasure which reinforces self-love. Unless our seer also employed feeling-terms such as pleasure and delight, he would be unable to show how and why man confirms affections and emotions as different in type from enticements gratifying to the ego.

The twofold division of mental life into will-love and understanding which underlies our psychology is closely in accord with the rejection of feeling as a faculty over against thought and will. To say that it is love which impels us to action, and that various affections springing from love find expression in our motives, is clearly to show how we are touched, in contrast with feeling at large. We enter an experience intensely to the degree in which love is concerned. The pleasure or pain which rises within us turns upon our affection as central. Feeling is secondary. A so-called egotistic feeling is self-love, while altruistic feeling is love for the neighbor. When referring to “bodily feelings” we may well say what we mean by reference to sense-perceptions and feeling-tones, that is, pleasure and pain; for many of our falsities are grounded in confusions concerning so-called bodily feeling.

Our seer sometimes uses the term feeling as equivalent to awareness of a bodily state or condition, but with explicit reference to localization of vitality in the brain as an appeal to unmistakable evidence in this connection. Thus, when by careful discrimination, the topic is
basis of man’s life in its cerebral principles and in the derivatives of such brain-states in the body, feeling in this special sense is evidential. Hence, we read that, among the various evidences, one is from “the feeling itself; since man perceives, when he exerts his mind and thinks, that he thinks in the brain. He draws in as it were the sight of the eye, contracts the forehead, and perceives the mental process to be within, especially inside the forehead, and somewhat above it.”\(^5\) This reference is not to spiritual thought, which our seer describes and explains in a very different way, never by using the term feeling.

The term bodily feeling would not be consistent with this psychology, because the body does not feel, and the mind does not directly feel the body—despite all our notions to the contrary. We are directly aware of mental states which correspond to states of the body. This discrimination is of profound importance. For it is a fallacy that we directly feel the body, a mere appearance that the brain thinks, even when it seems to do so when we contract the forehead or make exertions which seem as if we could “feel” the brain when thinking. Feelings which we vaguely attribute to the body are not intelligible until analyzed into their elements, some aspects of which may here be briefly suggested.

Apparently, everything in the body feels and acts from itself. But when we see the fallacy we may, in each instance, trace the matter to the fundamental principle: “Whatever lives and feels in man belongs to his spirit.”\(^5\) The several sense-perceptions taken to be feelings in relation to the body are invariably affections of the spirit. By sense-perception, the spirit is made aware that changes are taking place in the body. The sense of warmth and intimacy pertaining to what used to be called bodily feeling, is since we are aware of the experience as our own. It is this essentially personal relationship that is significant. In other connections, there are egocentric
sentiments which find varied description and are very far from being personal in the sense of the popular term self-feeling.

Caution in the use of feeling is also important because we might assume awareness of higher elements of our nature in its terms, whereas doctrine shows that we have but a limited awareness of the principles which are disclosed to celestial perception. Communication by correspondences is not “sensibly felt” by man in the natural degree: while that degree is paramount, man “knows nothing” of the opening of degrees. Activities and principles are disclosed all the way along (by doctrine) which lie entirely outside of the range of what has passed current as feeling, although we may seem to feel these things when instructed that they exist. The noteworthy instance is that of influx, which we do not feel as influx but as an experience which, being so explained, we understand as made possible by influx. To distinguish between what we feel, and what we understand to be true by doctrine, is vitally important. For the confusions between God and man on which falsities are founded are, for the most part, traceable to vagueness regarding what passes current as feeling. Again, this vagueness enters alleged communications with spirits, into mystical ecstasies, and into supposed inspirations. While the element of experience identified with feeling may be small, the interpretation put upon it may loom very large.

Since so much depends on what experiences signify, right instruction is needed to show why the range of consciousness is restricted, why we are not actually aware of realities and powers which we believe we touch by direct contact, and why it is better for us not to be aware of spirit-presences. Given precise knowledge, we may use such terms as love and affection with greater freedom and intelligence. We also understand why “love never reaches further than what it feels.” We can now interpret the teaching that spiritual love is not felt from itself, but
through natural love as “delight” or “bliss,” terms which have distinctive meanings not to be confused with feeling in general. A man may, indeed, feel either good or evil with delight. This being so, his feeling will be no guide. So, it is incumbent on him to consider what is good, what evil, and why delight is a clue rather than feeling.

Again, as it is not by feeling that one knows of the operation of Divine Providence, one understands why alleged guidance (accepted as if one could feel it) needs to be analyzed. In this, as in other connections, man must supply from doctrine what experience does not contribute, although we may interpret experience as profoundly significant. It is not, of course, denied that we often become keenly aware of aspects of experience which we do not understand. So-called feeling may thus far be real. A man might feel a spiritual sphere without knowing what he is perceiving. But the main point is that, with reference to guidances, or in any similar connection, the element of feeling so-called depends on other factors, concerning which we need instruction. Delight is frequently used where popular thought uses feeling. Yet, even this as a clue, points in another direction, since delight so often implies a type of affection which is not intelligible unless we understand self-love. Man does not feel self-love as such.

Some of our delights are sustained by inferior desires which prompt us to seek what we wish. Hence the importance of doctrine concerning the nature of pleasure. For all pleasantness and enjoyments are due to affections. They are sought from love of some sort as a motive, in alliance with the way we construe pleasure-seeking. As there are two types of love in competition, so there are two kinds of pleasure in opposition. Since each love has its own pleasure (for example, love of ruling), the satisfaction of the love is ordinarily due to quest for the anticipated pleasure. So, too, the lusts which beset interiors of the mind, flowing from the interiors into the body where they are likely to be judged by “feeling,” depend on the kind of
love that rules. Part of the pleasure itself is in anticipation. Thus, bodily pleasures easily follow from the mind’s pleasures. Insofar as such pleasures give satisfaction, the tendency to seek them becomes a habit. But different, indeed, is happiness regarded in spiritual light, originating as it does from another type of love, a type so different that no man can enjoy it until he puts away the lusts of evil. The happiness which pertains to goods and truths begins from Divine influx in the inmost. So, his is a radically different degree from that of pleasures vaguely associated with feeling and sought because we confuse desires with feelings which we think will bring satisfaction.

Since pleasures are of either will or understanding, we may group them with references to such matters as the possession of land and wealth, honor and public office, marital love, love for parents and children, friendship, and various intellectual interests. Then there are pleasures of the senses, as in the enjoyment of music, of beauty in relation to visible objects, of the sweetness of odors, of the agreeableness of foods and drinks, as well as pleasures connected with tactual sensations. The doctrine specifies these and other pleasures, having first made clear the affections from which such pleasures spring.

Pleasures related to the physical senses are classed as bodily, as “felt in the body,” but for the sake of distinguishing these from intellectual or other pleasures, and with the distinctions in mind which relate to the description of thought as associated with the brain. No bodily pleasure could exist without an interior affection in which the use of such pleasure is found. Pleasures, in this sense, are outermost effects, the bodily expression being secondary. So, too, there may be an external basis for the intellectual pleasure we take in corporeal things. To be immersed in bodily pleasures, as if what we call feeling were decisive, would, of course, be unfortunate. All
pleasures being such as the affections from which they spring, the more interior the affection, the more nearly we approximate standards having the sanction of heavenly doctrine.

It is permissible to take pleasure in such matters as food. Indeed, the sustaining quality of pleasure is compared to food. But it is the delight which gives the life. The corporeal and sensuous things on which delight feeds are lifeless by themselves. We need not renounce external pleasures because they appear to be corporeal and worldly. A man might make himself utterly miserable on the supposition that he must forego pleasures to enter heaven. What is essential is knowledge of the delights which imbue man’s interiors, especially that delight which springs from Divine goods and truths, from which may come “living pleasure.” True delight in pleasure naturally increases when externals are stripped off. The pleasures of marital love, as genuinely spiritual, immeasurably surpass pleasure which has not this high origin. Thus, too, there is pleasure due to charity, through delight in actual service done in the world.

Pleasure being intimately related to the affection from which it arises, we have a general principle by which to classify all delight, pleasantness, sweetness, and harmony about the conjunction of the given activity with the affection to which the delight is due. Thus, external delights are closely connected with the world, internal are identified with heaven. An external delight may be a hindrance, when due to a cupidity. The mind is then drawn away from celestial realities. The reason is that the cupidities are from loves of self and the world. Hence, the need for restraining or wholly abstaining from some of our pleasures. Organic vessels are opened by pleasures and delights. Some of these drag the external man downwards. The subtlety of this: what favors man’s pleasure he takes to be good, although it may be very far from it. Very different is the situation when man regards pleasures which are not opposed to the spirit but correspond to spiritual life as means to end. Then, the inward man may live content in a healthy
The internal and external become opposites only when the pleasures are taken to be ends in themselves. No spiritual man would regard such pleasures as an end.

“One who is in merely external pleasures makes much of himself, indulges his stomach, loves to live voluptuously, and makes the height of pleasure to consist in eatables and drinkables. One who is [actuated by higher love] in internal things also finds pleasure in these [externals]; but his ruling affection is to nourish his body with food pleasurably for the sake of his health, to the end that he may have a sound mind in a sound body, thus chiefly for the sake of the health of the mind, to which the health of the body serves as a means. One who is spiritual does not rest here, but regards the health of the mind or soul as a means for the acquisition of intelligence and wisdom—not for the sake of reputation, honors, and gain.” So, in turn, even wisdom and intelligence become means to a higher end that in every case a man’s purpose may determine his life and constitute its quality.

A man needs to know in what respect he is “dead” because of infernal conditions, or alive through spiritual influx. The natural man is likely to deny even the existence of higher pleasures, because he regards himself in everything he does, and is blind to any higher incentive. Such a man rejects as utterly worthless whatever he takes to be separate from himself. Not even wishing to know anything beyond, he closes the door to the pleasures that might ensue. Experiencing no pleasure in contemplating a higher mode of life, he receives no influx tending toward it. Thus, he even regards as utterly vile and servile the alleged benefits from such a mode of life, in comparison with the pleasures he experiences through bodily senses and evil affections. Thus, a life of voluptuousness is “spiritual death,” with its inward dissuasions against every prompting from a Divine source. So, too, corporeal pleasures lead to diseases.
It follows from the general doctrine that true pleasure or happiness, ascending to the level of beatitude, depends on the opening of inward degrees. Pleasures due to love of Divine goods, in contrast with the lusts of evil, naturally differ most in internals. Heavenly pleasures surpass description in words and must be known by experience. These pleasures are perceptible to feeling, although transcending what comes within the scope of understanding. It is impossible, therefore, to compare the highest happiness with the pleasures of lust for evil. We may discern what we cannot describe, insofar as we realize that the enjoyment is invariably from love. The Lord is inwardly in the higher pleasures, those due to love for heavenly goods. It follows that, the more intimately anyone is conjoined with the Lord, the happier he becomes. Although the highest types of happiness are rarely manifested in the world, there is a measure of peace of mind felt even here by men in their natural state. The varieties and enjoyments of man’s existence constitute a considerable portion of his life in any event. Action from enjoyment is intimately connected with action from freedom and reason. So, too, there is the closest connection between vital heat and delights of affection, and enjoyments due to perceptions and thoughts. Since external enjoyments lure the internal selfhood to give consent, and by directing thought banish reflection, we have a clue to the pleasures to be avoided. Whatever a man regards and loves as delightful he wills to realize or attain. Hence, much depends on a man’s conclusions regarding so-called delightful experiences. He may seek the “inmost deliciousness” which flows into marital love, peace of soul, and tranquility of mind; or he may not, according to the values he attributes to such experiences.

So, too, pain varies with the interior state. There is mute pain in regard to many matters of moral significance, for example, among those who are conscientious; but acute pain with those in whom spiritual perception has been quickened. Thus envy, anguish, and other intense
emotions depend on the spiritual state. All anxiety and grief arise from the deprivations of what we love. Again, a man may be in pain and anxiety when his cupidities are being removed. Pain ensues when delight is cut off. During temptation there may be many spiritual griefs, interior miseries, and great despair. Naturally, pain is something localized in the skull, now in one region of the head, and now in another. Some of these pains are due to falsities from cupidities which bear relation to processes of change in regeneration. Pain may be internal or external. Much depends on the interpretation attached to pains known as spiritual combats. In general, pain is not described and explained as a sensation, or with reference to disagreeable feeling-tones allied with sensation. For pain is not regarded as external in origin and it is not seen from below but is always regarded from above with reference to spiritual states when discerned alright. Everything turns upon the interpretation of such states, man’s conflicts being essentially encounters between the two types of love, while he is held in equilibrium between the worlds.

Since the Lord is inwardly in the higher pleasures, those due to heavenly goods, it follows that the more intimately anyone is conjoined with the Lord, the happier he becomes. Although the highest types of happiness are rarely manifested in the world, there is a measure of peace of mind felt even here by men in their natural states. The varieties and enjoyments of man’s existence constitute a considerable portion of his life in any event. Action from enjoyment is intimately connected with action from freedom and from reason. So, too, there is the closest connection between vital heat and delights of affection, and enjoyments due to perceptions and thoughts. Since external enjoyments allure the internal selfhood to give consent, and (by directing thought) banish reflection, we have a clue to pleasures that are to be avoided. Whatever a man loves and regards as delightful, he wills to realize or attain. Here much depends on a man’s conclusions regarding so-called delightful experiences. He may seek the “inmost
deliciousness” which flows into marital love, peace of soul, and tranquility of mind, or he may not, according to the values which he attributes to such experiences.\textsuperscript{557}

So too pain varies with the interior state. There is mute pain regarding many matters of moral significance, for example among those who have conscience; but acute pain with those in whom spiritual perception has been quickened.\textsuperscript{558} Thus, envy, anguish, and other intense emotions depend on the spiritual state. All anxiety and grief are plainly due to deprivation of the things we love.
Chapter 30

Emotion

The emotions are not described as a class because love, ordinarily recognized as chief among the emotions, is identified with will, and will is fundamental. Because love is given the central place in structure and function, this conception of the personal life might be called a psychology of the emotions. Yet, this would be highly misleading if we should import into the present description, the usual account of the emotions as “flighty” or unstable, or so mingled with bodily states and passions as to be almost indistinguishable from them. Love in this doctrine occupies a far more prominent place than in a mere psychology of the emotions; and love is neither evanescent nor superficial, either as a bodily reaction, or as a personal state.

Love in its higher forms is spiritual. It is one in spirit with quickening affection toward the neighbor, and aspiration toward unison with the Lord, also one with marital love as attributable to heavenly influences. There remains for love in its lower forms only that classification which associates it with self-love, and love for the world, with allied affections which unite these loves with their objects. Under these loves and their derivative affections belong states ordinarily described as emotions, but here put in marked contrast with spiritual love. For spiritual love is stable or constant, deep and true; while such emotions as fear, rage or anger, bitterness, envy, jealousy, vindictiveness, and hatred, are usually in rapid change or very intense while they last. Thus, typical emotions yield place to some other mental state in the swift transition often attendant upon animosity or antagonism in its most penetrative form.
The coarser emotions are, therefore, to be understood as wide as the poles asunder from love as spiritual. Thus, anger is a general affection which results from anything that goes contrary to man’s proper love and attendant evil desires. “Whatever does not favor our own proper love and the love of the world excites contrariety, which is manifested by anger.” A man may become angry with whatever he takes to be the forces operating against him, when he wants his own way and is bent on gaining it at any cost. Hence, anger indicates departure from charity. In this sense, it is equivalent to hatred. Its cause is everything that endeavors to destroy the delight of genuine love. Again, it may mean opposition to any influence which stands in the way of what is good and true. Yet it differs from zeal, because it is evil, whereas in zeal there is good. Hence, the emotion which is commonly called righteous indignation when spiritually perceived, is understood as zeal, which is its interior essence. “He who is in anger intends evil to another with whom he is angry.” Hence, anger is always identified with self-love. Anger leads into temptation, it punishes, casts into hell, and continues to produce evil from itself; it persecutes from hatred and revenge, and wills evil to all with whom it fights.

Some disturbances which arouse anger are results of previous wrongdoing. These states are punishments brought on as reactions from our deeds and are not to be attributed to forces against which we might otherwise be angry. The falsity that God “punishes” mankind is the reigning idea, in many instances, where such anger arises. Naturally, we flare up when loves of self and of the world are attacked. It is really the evil in us that is angry, not goods or truths. Hence, zeal for the right and the true is always to be distinguished from anger as selfish emotion.

So, too, there is revenge, due to an evil desire, to envy in its various forms, and as an origin of disease. These coarser emotions, together with all the lusts which stand in antithesis to marital love, are due to man’s selfishness and sexuality in debased forms; hence, they are classed
over against love in its spirituality. Again, grief, with its complaints and anxieties, arises in contrast with higher states, or when there is conflict involving the unregenerate self. What is important to know is that, when man is being regenerated there are combats, the grief often being due to the bitterness of the temptation. There may also be grief from hunger and thirst.

Hate, too, as the emotion most sharply contrasted with love, is known by means of loves of self and the world which constitute man’s hell: love of self is hatred toward the Lord and the neighbor. Hate is the fountain of all iniquities and abominations. He who loves self, hates all who do not serve him. Hate and delight in doing injury to a person belong together. As in hatred there is no charity, so there are manifold states in which hate is known by putting it in contrast with its opposite. Indeed, love of self stores up hatreds until it makes of its world a hell. He who hates incessantly, kills what he hates, or tries to kill it. Obscurities from love of self and the world then enter in. The external aspect of hate is pride. In other forms, it is aversion or antipathy. In any event, if we understand the ruling affection, we need not dwell on the forms of its manifestation in man’s behavior. There is always thick darkness when there is hatred instead of charity. Thus hatred, revenge and cruelty are intimately connected. Hatred cherished inwardly is a cause of disease, thus of spiritual disjunctions.

Anxiety, akin to many of the emotions arising in connection with temptation, also appears when a man is forced to act contrary to conscience. With the unregenerate, anxieties arise when anything happens contrary to their loves. Other anxieties are due to false spheres, to the deprivations of possessions which we insist shall be ours; to worldly cares, solicitude for truth, and to disquietude over our future. Anxiety also arises in connection with states affecting the stomach and viscera with constriction and pain. Any desire for ends which we are eager to attain is likely to be accompanied by anxiety, the anxiety increasing with the anticipation.
Anxiety is present as distress of soul, not only during sickness, but in straightness of spirit during processes of regeneration, and through loss of faith and charity. The melancholy type of anxiety is caused by an infirm state of mind and body, while vitiation of the body through sickness is an obvious cause. Anxiety also bears relation to waiting and longing, and other states well known by those who are keenly aware of inner experience.\textsuperscript{569}

Temptation as spiritually significant is, of course, more than a merely mental conflict.\textsuperscript{570} Our natural temptations are mere anxieties due to conflicts amidst our natural affections, or excited by misfortunes and illnesses. There is an anxiety, however, in any temptation of serious moment, due to doubt concerning the presence and mercy of the Lord. Therefore, a great deal depends on our convictions concerning the Divine presence and the plenitude of the Lord’s mercy. Insofar as these states become a question of doctrine, the subject falls, for the most part, outside of our present study.

Our anxieties increase with age because man removes himself from childlike tranquility through absorption in worldly cares.\textsuperscript{571} Anxiety arises through lack of perception of the happiness of eternal life. To be in heaven, is to be devoid of all solicitousness, unrest and anxiety. If we enter vividly into the thought of heaven, keenly realizing in imagination at least what celestial joys are like, what are the fruits of spiritual peace, we need not study in detail the anxieties which beset man in his progress toward heaven. The significant truth is that lower emotional states are intelligible in contrast with higher spiritual states that are inseparable from love in its purest forms. Anxiety is always secondary to the ruling affection, or the disturbed affections which give rise to it. Hence, the inner life cannot be explained by appeal to anxiety as a central cause of disturbance. No legitimate inference can be drawn to the effect that, if we cease to worry or to be anxious, all will be well. The practical applications of this teaching do not
coincide with the popular counsels of the day concerning the avoidance of worry. For the appeal is to what is fundamental. It is love, never the mere worry intermittently intruding upon it that rules.

Hence, it is important to penetrate beneath emotion to its meaning. Thus the “fear of God” may be fear of losing His love. It may involve aversion to doing anything against the Lord and the neighbor. Again, to fear may be to disbelieve, or not to have faith and love. It may block the way to regeneration, and it must wane before man can be reformed. “No man can be reformed in a state of fear” because fear takes away freedom and reason. Love opens the mind’s interiors while fear closes them.

Fear may seize upon our thought externally and so it may pass without incident. Fortunately for us, it cannot take possession of our inward thought. Fear of the loss of honor or gain; fear of civil punishments, as well as fear in many of its expressions, is to be understood with reference to states amidst which it appears. Fear of infernal punishment would imply acceptance of a doctrine concerning hell; whereas, he who knows that hell is self-love, is also aware that such love brings its reaction in kind here and now. The fear especially to be guarded against is the emotion which intercepts the Divine influx and brings confusion into the inner life. What is imperative is insight into impeding emotions which enable us to penetrate each one to the underlying cause. This cause will prove without exception to be an affection springing from self-love. When fear gains such a hold that it takes away rationality and liberty, it is indeed time to penetrate its meanings to the core. The more securely grounded in freedom and rationality, the less reason we must fear.

In brief, fear runs through the whole gamut of motivations from fearfulness and dread in a simple natural sense to spiritual or holy fear. It may entail what is popularly known as terror, or
in a milder sense, consternation. Intimately allied with various commotions of the lower mind (including the glands, we would now say), it changes with the states of that mind. Naturally, much depends on that which evokes a sense of danger or implies penalties likely to ensue, worst of all the consequences of hell. Very much depends on the knowledge by which our fears are interpreted.

Thus, too, hope as an emotion, increases or decreases according to man’s rational insight. Man is kept in a state of hope by higher influences while under temptation. He who permits such influences to aid him, is both cheered and kept in an affirmative state. With the removal of fear, hope enters. It is everything to know that, in our spiritual struggles, the Divine succor is both mediately and immediately present, to give refreshment, hope, and victory. Again, there is spiritual suggestiveness in the fact that genuine hope enters with those whose faith implies dependence on Divine goods and truths. He who is in faith and obedience has hope in the sense of “hearing” that which quickens his hope. Since every falsity has its opposite in spiritual states of various types, hope is oftentimes the general state which is the more apparent; while over against it, may be a hundred lesser or negative states which fortunately are banished by affirmative hope quickened by the Divine life in us. Hope in the supreme sense enters when temptation has done its uttermost by all the subtleties which it entails. When temptation is finally overcome, man is elevated above these besetting emotions and brought into a state of constancy.

The power of jealousy also depends upon the interpretation put upon it. Among people in genuine marital love, the state called jealousy may be prudence and zeal, lest love be violated. The jealousy which plays havoc is, of course, due to suspicion, to sickness of mind. To realize what zeal for marital love is (as an ideal), is plainly to see its sources. Hence it is to guard against confusing it with rage, or with any sense of personal injury likely to prompt an impulse to fight
against those who seem guilty of wrong-doing. Love naturally rises in protection and self-defense, even into indignation and anger on occasion. But love with its zeal for ideal values is always to be contrasted with emotions which, taken by themselves, would work havoc not only in the inner life, but in the marital relation. It is better to substitute the term zeal, whenever we mean a worthy state of the affections, in contrast with jealousy as an impetus toward violent rage. Likewise, in case of the horrid fear of loss of love, it is better to envisage the state with reference to conditions amidst which it appears. 577

Spiritual love seeks union according to type, as surely as passion is drawn to its kind. As naturally, it is accompanied by emotions which, implying fear lest anything should intervene, express zeal for this union, a zeal touched at times by fear lest the two who are in a state of tender love should be torn asunder. Both zeal and jealousy, as ordinarily understood, depend on the plane which love attains in any form of marriage, natural or spiritual. It is important to know that zeal has its seat in the understanding of the man who receives the love of his consort, and that its quality depends on his wisdom, together with his love for her in return. Hence, a man’s zeal is appreciable in relation to his standards of honor and the protection accorded by the understanding. Jealousy due to lack of true love belongs in another category.

The emotions which pertain to patriotism and loyalty belong with the civic virtues and reasonable love of the world as an object of natural interests. Patriotism has its rightful place in a description of virtue essential to cooperation with one’s fellow men. So, too, loyalty is imperative. A man must concentrate. He should lead a life of practical usefulness in the world. Indeed, there is every reason for the expression of his life in concrete activities essential to natural welfare. The emotions which foster these virtues are to be classed with affections to
which they are due; whereas, spiritual love prompts man to loyalties of a very different sort, pertaining not along to existence in this world, but to man’s eternal welfare.

To translate the description of mental elements and processes in the preceding chapters into the terms used today, with special reference to the stimuli and responses implying behavior, would be to begin from the top and work down, whereas current psychology works from below, and does not ascend far. The first stimulus is from Divine influx. Even in stimuli ordinarily attributed to events in the world, the incoming process is purely secondary. We must presuppose a Divine stimulus in every descending process: from Love to will-love with derivative affections; from Wisdom to understanding with derivative intellectual affections. Thus, there is an impetus into all types of perception, thus into all cognitive processes down to the lower, or “first rational,” and the crude responses of man’s early ignorance. Man’s will-faculty is a type of response (to love) according to the affection that rules. His desires constitute another type of response, also feeling (through pleasure, delight, or pain) and the emotions. Granted responses classed as motives, conduct of some sort results, as in the deeds of the Good Samaritan. Accordingly, the body is seen doing such things as raising the fallen individual into a comfortable position. Given behavior as a general process, the Good Samaritan adjusts his organism to its environment by procuring food, transportation, or whatever is required. It is this, the most external part of the process, with which the meager psychology of the day is concerned. Our doctrine corrects this poverty-stricken version of human existence by describing and explaining the entire range of stimulus-responses from the interior recipiency to its most external consequences.

Plainly, this is a dynamic psychology of emotion and love-will. The central emphasis repeatedly falls on doctrine as the corrective of appearances, fallacies and obscurities. Sometimes
the study of the soul seems almost lost in dry detail. Yet, every doctrinal emphasis carries the reminder that man’s attitude is a crucial factor and that, implied in his attitude, is always the love he seeks and lives by. Emotion is aroused by any doctrine which yields actual results. Some impetus or effort ensues. The situation is made dramatic by realizing that a contrary love with its affections might have come into power.

A great region of the inner life is brought into clear relief when these momentous matters are reduced to the two types of love. The more penetrating our study of any emotion such as anger, hatred or fear, the closer we are brought to the ego as actuated by self-love. All the ills or evils of life are thus brought to a focus. Yet, this is only one side of the story. The ego may also be actuated by love to the Lord and the neighbor. The entire life of charity is implied, with a wealth of goods and truths.

For man may be open, more or less responsive, according to the degree of his inner life. He is not primarily closed or open because of what would nowadays be called a complex or repression, which a special technique would disclose by analysis of dreams or by appeal to sexuality. What is significantly interior cannot be understood without taking account of the state of man’s spirit, adapted to existence in two worlds, with an interior and an exterior memory; and all that constitutes his ordinary life under obscurity when he mistakes himself for a creature of flesh and blood.

This doctrine does not stop with inferences concerning man’s emotional conflicts. It raises the question for everyone how man comes to be centrally in conflict between forces, what the spheres of influence are to which he is subject, and what ones among all these spheres belong rather to the spiritual world than to the natural. Since man responds to the influences by which he is environed with his whole nature, we must know both his nature and the totality of forces
vitaly associated with him. This undertaking seems audacious, unaware as we are of most of these forces. Yet we can confidently take our stand in the inner world as doctrine discloses it to us. We may look from within-outward, recasting the teachings of the day which invert the spiritual order. We have so accustomed ourselves to theories and patterns imposed from the outside that we need precisely this radical insight in utter rejection of all naturalisms.

Surprising to relate, however, these doctrines come so far forth into the realm of bodily processes and brain-states, together with references to cerebral conditions in which will and understanding reside in “first principles,” that we seem, at times, to be concerned with purely physiological psychology. The significance of this emergence into bodily matters is, we have found, in the trend of these doctrines to signalize the “ultimate” wherein inmost and outermosts are found together. In a profound sense, therefore, this doctrine is an appeal to fact, and no recent discovery concerning the dependence of mind on brain, on emotions or glands, would fail to find its place. We are all living on this overt plane. Here our bodies are engaged in their behavior. Here are witnessed the signs of moral conduct. Since this teaching is a language of correspondences, if we had the eyes to discern the signs in their integrity we could follow in thought from sign to reality, from body to spirit, and thus to the interiors of that world which is closed to external vision. There is surely no reason for reverting to the dogma that “theological matters transcend the comprehension and cannot therefore be reached by the exercise of reason.”

We are invited to follow reason to the highest limit, permitting no exclusiveness in terms of theory to separate space and time from eternity, the natural from the spiritual. In thus giving reason its freest play, we are also true to our inmost existence as spiritual beings, endowed with spiritual love and the possibilities of spiritual perception.
Yet, in thus ending this the introductory study of the seer’s teaching as a whole, we are reminded anew that this is a dynamic psychology, a psychology of love thus of the affections in their contrasts and varied expressions. This means the primacy of emotion in place of the old-time intellectualism, which greatly neglected the emotions. Impressions on memory, for example, are due to love or affection, not primarily to interest or attention. An old memory which gives us trouble recurs because of this affectional element, rather than any awakening of mere associations. This love-element is more significant than any mental imagery.

Because of the primacy of love or an affection of some sort, the direct method of overcoming any adverse memory or reminder of experience is by substitution, not by argument to overcome the ideas affiliated with the old disturbance. To efface an undesirable emotion at any time in our experience, the change is to be made in the same way. A new or better affection is to displace the old, as charity is put where harsh judgments ruled, as forgiveness replaces bitter condemnation. Good is thus to overcome evil, evil to rule where falsities held sway. To see the reasons for this displacement may be important. To cultivate different imagery would be a help. But the central change is in the sphere of love, notably when self-love yields to love of doing good to the neighbor because of the good in him.

Much depends on the order of relationship of love-will to understanding, and thus to modes of affectional expression. Changed ideas follow changed affections. The heart is touched first. Much depends on knowing that unity in the personal life, replacing duality or conflict, is to be attained when love is integrated with understanding. But it is love that opens the way for the incoming of life to instigate and make secure the unity.

While we may have no powers essentially our own, to become effective in self-improvements of any sort, we have life to use as if ours, we can change in affection and attitude,
withdrawing oppositions to the life with which it is our privilege to cooperate. The first vital step is taken by frank admission of troubles to be rectified, ills to be overcome, conflicts to be resolved or evils to be conquered. For new motives need to reign where adverse desires, excuses, denials and falsities were in power. Willingness to be led out of what we have honestly admitted prepares the way for this new motivation. Instead of giving primary attention to bodily expressions of inner states, we will now seek light on the states which most nearly correspond with Divine influx, seeking our reformation. Enlightenment concerning the body as “obedience” also gives us a clue. Emphasis on self-love reminds us that the ego is central, that the ego has a prevailing love or ruling passion; hence that one must look to self with greater zeal, endeavoring to purify the heart, to be more faithful to conscience, seeking Divine goods and truths as priceless in value. Hitherto, many of us have been evasive in these respects. We have defended our lower motives, confirming ourselves in the modes of thought and affection which seemed to substantiate our self-love. It is a far step from the self-love which arrogates power to realization of the truth that we have no power save as recipients of the Life which we share from within and above.

The same principles will be brought before us when, turning from the analysis of the elements of mentality as disclosed by these doctrines, we consider such matters as sleep and dreams, spheres and spiritual states, adverse correspondences, and the nature of evil; also the nature of conscience, the questions of freedom and responsibility, the sphere of faith, the part played by temptation, the beginnings of regeneration, and other subjects more directly related to man’s place in the spiritual world. Again, there remain for special study such topics as the nature of so-called psychical experiences, visions, the functions of spirits, the nature and significance of mystical experiences, together with the relationships of spirit and body at death. Finally, we shall
be more directly concerned with the seer’s method, with the tests of seership, and thus with matters relating to Divine revelation in the language of correspondences on which this whole psychology depends. While this doctrine is plainly of immediate practical value in reckoning with the same matters which other applied psychologies bring before us in our day, the surpassing value or test will be found in its universality as a doctrine of two-world experience, a venture never made with such thoroughness in the history of thought.
Endnotes


3 See Julius A. Dresser, The True History of Mental Science: a Lecture Delivered at the Church of the Divine Unity, Boston, Mass., on Sunday evening Feb. 6, 1887 (Boston: A Mudge, 1887); Julius A. Dresser, The True History of Mental Science; the Facts Concerning the Discovery of Mental Healing (Boston: Ellis, 1899); Annetta Dresser, The Philosophy of P. P. Quimby, with Selections from His Manuscripts and a Sketch of His Life (Boston, G.H. Ellis, 1895).


5 Horatio W. Dresser, The Immanent God: An Essay (Boston: Published by the Author, 1895), 17, 25.

6 National Cyclopedia of American Biography, XI (1901), 110.


10 Horatio W. Dresser, In Search of a Soul, 74.


15 James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, 92-93, 118.


18 Ronald Hughes (ed.), *Phineas Parkhurst Quimby: His Complete Writings and Beyond* (Howard City, MI: Phineas Parkhurst Quimby Resource Center, 2009), 106. One example of Dresser’s articles during this period was his “The Age of John Locke,” *Home Progress*, 6 (1916-17), 53-59.


25 Hughes (ed.), *Phineas Parkhurst Quimby: His Complete Writings and Beyond*, 121.


http://www.ppquimby.com/anderson/chapter_4.htm#iii.%20Middle%20and%20Later%20Years (January 17, 2011).


Part I

1 George Trobridge, *Emanuel Swedenborg, His Life, Teachings and Influence* (New York: New-Church Press, 1918), Chapter II.

2 Quoted by Benjamin Worcester, *The Life and Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg* (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1883), 127.

3 Ibid., 128, 131.

4 Ibid., 163.


6 Translation, edited, by Frank Sewall, 1887.

7 Ibid., xv.

8 Ibid., 117.

9 Ibid., 184.

10 Ibid., 187.

11 Ibid, 319, following.

12 This summary is based on *The Divine Love and Wisdom*, referred to as W.

13 W, 4, 89.
Its reality becomes intelligible with reference to sense-perception, which is in its turn intelligible only in case spiritual perception has first been interpreted.
41 A., 6322.
42 A., 994.
44 A., 1594.
45 A., 1807.
46 A., 5121.
47 A., 512, 4925.
48 M., 30.
49 E., 53.
50 A., 141, 1616, 1786.
51 A., 1806; T., 28.
52 A., 1919.
53 A., 393.
54 A., 1953.
55 A., 2144.
56 H., 434.
57 W., 264.
58 W., 425.
59 A., 444.
60 A., 4054, 4325, 5145.
61 W., 387.
62 W., 365.
63 T., 361.
64 A., 501.
65 A., 3884; W., 384.
66 A., 4041, 4054.
67 W., 42, 191; H., 463.
68 W., 362; I., 13.

389
Difficulties involved in the usual application of “first principles” will be clarified in the chapter on Mental Origins, especially about the relation between Habit and the brain as the *basis* of habit in terms of the exterior memory.
A., 1486, 6077.
A., 7337.
S., 27.
A., 2487.
E., 105.
E., 114.
A., 2475.
A., 2490.
A., 2473.
A., 5489.
A., 4018.
P., 233.
A., 561, 1050, 1738, 2280.
A., 5342, 6156.
A., 2475.
A., 3494.
T., 103.
I., 7.
A., 545.
A., 2487.
W., 215, 365.
H., 212.
I., 11.
A., 5435.
A., 3470.
A., 3570.
A., 9154.
W., 215.
151 A., 8603.
152 E., 1146.
153 P., 195.
154 P., 124.
155 P., 183.
156 A., 1661.
157 W., 218.
158 E., 726, 918.
159 A., 3748.
160 A., 5173.
161 A., 4223.
162 A., 3741, 3748, 4325.
163 A., 9293.
164 H., 228.
165 A., 4393.
166 A., 4380.
167 P. 178.
168 A., 5131.
169 A., 9473.
170 W., 215.
171 R., 875.
172 A., 880.
174 A., 1462.
175 A., 5726.
176 A., 4676.
177 P., 4.
178 A., 4345.
179 A., 4659.
180 W., 390.
181 A., 1594.
182 Div. Wis., VIII, 2.
183 P., 61.
184 A., 1594.
185 A., 2930.
186 A., 6053.
187 A., 1815, 3570.
188 A., 2005.
189 A., 6716.
190 A., 1807.
192 A., 1000.
193 A., 1436.
194 A., 3747.
195 A., 4149.
196 A., 5487.
197 P., 199.
198 A., 5141.
199 A., 808.
200 A., 2475.
201 A., 5145.
202 A., 2737.
203 A., 2879.
204 A., 2873.
205 A., 5114.
206 A., 6135.
Of major importance in terms of what is supplied come to doctrines of Correspondence and Influx, together with the doctrine of Degrees. Some readers will wish to anticipate by turning to Chapter 17. But from a strictly psychological viewpoint it is more intelligible to note the accumulating evidences in favor of these cardinal doctrines.
To be considered more at length in Chapter 22.
260 A., 4214.
261 A., 5128.
262 A., 4214.
263 A., 3337.
264 H., 300.
265 M., 267.
266 A., 6620.
267 W., 7.
268 A., 1013.
269 A., 1505.
270 A., 2209.
271 A., 3605, 6472.
272 M., 310.
273 A., 2557.
274 T., 480.
275 A., 2557; E., 654.
276 E., 730.
277 A., 3702.
278 P., 83.
279 A., 10225.
280 A., 430.
281 A., 2280.
282 A., 3183.
283 A., 3494.
284 A., 3504.
285 A., 4383.
286 A., 4653.
287 A., 5608.
Eugene Joseph E Schreck, *Child Psychology in the Light of the New Church, as Applied to Religious Training.*

*Three Addresses* (Boston, MA: New Church Union, 1924)15.
These statements are significant in contrast with present-day emphasis on association, interest, and attention, to the neglect of both love and will.

Interest and attention are not neglected in this teaching, but these factors are not decisive. The foregoing exposition conclusively shows that this is a psychology of love.
P., 233.
T., 32.
T., 39.
A., 129.
T., 273.
W., 363.
A., 9399.
P., 103.
A., 904.
A., 4674.
A., 4676.
W., 373.
A., 1072.
A., 7381.
A., 2228, 2474.
A., 4884.
A., 3957.
P., 59.
W., 7.
A., 4901.
P., 49.
A., 5287, 6040.
A., 5302.
A., 2515.
M., 35.
A., 5423.
A., 3483.
W., 390.
Repetitions of statements in preceding chapters are unnecessary to make explicit the central principle implied in their studies of will, love and understanding.

A., 3628.

H., 569.

A., 905; P., 33.

W., 275.

A., 1707.

A., 3318.

A., 5828.

A., 3138, 3318.

A., 3484.

H., 296.

H., 202.

W., 275.

P., 139.

A., 3913.

A., 4072.

T., 14.

T., 118

W., 56.

W., 55.

W., 218.

H., 87-99.

T., 367.

W., 372.

A., 8168.

A., 6473.

A., 7270.
424 T., 71.
425 A., 1495.
426 A., 5993.
427 A., 265, 268.
428 A., 1589.
429 A., 1443.
430 A., 5126.
431 A., 10225.
432 A., 2280.
433 A., 1589.
434 A. 1940.
435 A., 1953.
436 A., 5084.
437 A., 5128.
438 A., 1944.
439 P., 233.
440 A., 2577.
441 A., 2588, 3108.
442 A., 7130.
443 A., 3160.
444 A., 3321.
445 A., 5008.
446 A., 6240.
447 E., 569.
448 A., 1935.
449 A., 3108.
450 A., 3264.
451 A., 3365.
This observation was confirmed after Swedenborg’s time by the change in scientific viewpoint from molecules and atoms to electrons and protons, thus to the conception of centers of radiant energy.
On jealousy in its various relationships, see Marital Love, 357-75.